MNEMOSYNE

BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA BATAVA

COLLEGERUNT

H. PINKSTER · H.S. VERSNEL

D.M. SCHENKEVELD · P.H. SCHRIJVERS

S.R. SLINGS

BIBLIOTHECAE FASCICULOS EDENDOS CURAVIT

H. PINKSTER, KLASSIEK SEMINARIUM, OUDE TURFMARKT 129, AMSTERDAM

SUPPLEMENTUM DUCENTESIMUM QUINQUAGESIMUM PRIMUM

STEVEN J. GREEN

OVID, *FASTI* 1

TUTA SUB AEGIDE PALLAS · 1683 ·

OVID, *FASTI* 1

A COMMENTARY

BY

STEVEN J. GREEN

BRILL
LEIDEN · BOSTON
2004

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Green, Steven J.
Ovid, *Fasti* 1: a commentary / by Steven J. Green.
p. cm. — (Mnemosyne, bibliotheca classica Batava. Supplementum, ISSN 0169-8958 ; 251)
Enlargement of author's thesis (doctoral)—University of Manchester, 1999.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 90-04-13985-0
1. Ovid, 43 B.C.-17 or 18 A.D. *Fasti.* Book 1. 2. Didactic poetry, Latin—History and criticism. 3. Literature and society—Rome. 4. Fasts and feasts in literature. 5. Calendar in literature. 6. Rome—In literature. 7. Time in literature. I. Title: *Fasti* 1. II. Title. III. Series.

PA6519.F9G74 2004
871'.01—dc22

2004050327

ISSN 0169-8958
ISBN 90 04 13985 0

© Copyright 2004 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910 Danvers, MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

MIX
Paper from responsible sources
FSC® C109576
www.fsc.org

Printed by Printforce, the Netherlands

To my grandfather, Tom,
who would have read with both
interest and insight

CONTENTS

Preface ix
List of Abbreviations and Text Used xi

Introduction
I: Expectation and Re-Evaluation in Ovid, *Fasti* 1 1
II: Textual and Temporal in *Fasti* 1: Exile, Revision and the Reader 15

Commentary 27
List of References 329
Indices 339

PREFACE

In spite of being a rich and varied work from a renowned classical poet, Ovid's *Fasti* received very little attention until the mid 1970's, especially from literary critics; when it was studied, it was typically regarded as either a reliable source from which to quarry religious information, or an unsound project from a poet too often prone to religious inaccuracies. It is no exaggeration to say, however, that the poem has undergone a revolution in the past twenty-five years. Scholars from a variety of disciplines have applied their critical skills to the poem, and have uncovered a work which is both rich in literary heritage and a powerful witness and critic of late-Augustan and early-Tiberian imperial Rome. It is, moreover, a revolution which shows no signs of losing momentum: the first ever collection of essays on the poem, edited by Herbert-Brown (2002), is both a celebration of recent scholarship and a call for further fruitful avenues of study.

The present commentary—the most detailed yet on any single book of the poem—concentrates on Book 1, a book which has proven particularly challenging to the reader in light of the apparent revision of text during the poet's exile (see Introduction, II). In the spirit of the recent renewal of interest in the poem, my strategy has been to integrate the secondary scholarship fully into the commentary. Consequently, rather than remaining 'neutral'—an unrealistic expectation for either the writing of a commentary or a study of *Fasti*—I venture my own views in the commentary, whilst endeavouring to provide readers with sufficient information to enable them to come to their own informed opinions. If it does not win over in all its parts, the commentary aims to stimulate debate and further the scholarly interest on this dynamic text for the next twenty-five years.

A commentary on part of *Fasti* 1 was presented for the doctoral degree at the University of Manchester in September 1999. First and foremost, the work has benefited greatly from the continuous encouragement and critical judgment of my supervisor, Roy Gibson. Furthermore, it is my pleasure to express sincere gratitude to a variety of scholars who have, since submission of the thesis, read some or all of the draft of the present commentary, offering some stimulating suggestions and delivering me from error: Tim Cornell and

Robert Maltby (Ph.D. examiners); Barbara Weiden Boyd, Sergio Casali, Denis Feeney, Monica Gale, James McKeown, Carole Newlands, Costas Panayotakis, John Rich and Alison Sharrock. It should not, of course, be assumed that any or all of these scholars agree with everything that is said in the commentary, and I accept full responsibility for any inaccuracies. I must also express my gratitude for the financial support that I have received over the years from the University of Manchester, in the forms of the Hannah and Joseph Lees Fellowship (1996–8) and the Margaret Williamson Fund (1998–9); I have also benefited greatly from being appointed Honorary Research Fellow in Classics (2003–4). Lastly and most importantly, I am ever grateful to my parents, Momo, my brother, family and friends for their constant support, both morally and financially. This is, ultimately, for all of you.

Manchester
February, 2004

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AWC	Alton, E., Wormell, D., and Courtney, E. (eds.), *Ovidius Fasti* (Teubner Stuttgart, 1988)
BNP	Beard, M, North, J. and Price, S., *Religions of Rome Volume I: A History; Volume II: A Sourcebook* (Cambridge, 1998)
CIL	*Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* (Berlin, 1863–)
CO	Deferrari, R., Barry, M. & McGuire, M., *A Concordance of Ovid* (Washington, 1939)
Degrassi	Degrassi, A., *Inscriptiones Italiae* Vol. 13.2 (Rome, 1963)
H.-Sz.	Hofmann, J. and Szantyr, A., *Lateinische Grammatik: Zweiter Band* (Munich, 1972)
K.-St.	Kühner, R. and Stegmann, C., *Ausführliche Grammatik der Lateinischen Sprache* (Hannover, 1966)
Lewis/Short	Lewis, C., Short, C., *A Latin Dictionary, founded on Andrews' Edition of Freund's Latin Dictionary* (Oxford, 1879)
LIMC	*Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae* (Zurich/Munich, 1981–)
Maltby	Maltby, R., *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies* (Leeds, 1991)
OCD	Hornblower, S. and Spawforth, A. (eds.), *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (Oxford, 1996)
OLD	Glare, P. (ed.), *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (Oxford, 1984)
Platner/Ashby	Platner, S. and Ashby, T., *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* (Oxford, 1929)
RE	Pauly, A., Wissowa, G. and Kroll, W., *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* (Stuttgart, 1893–)
Richardson	Richardson, L., *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* (Johns Hopkins, 1992)
Steinby	Steinby, M., *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae* (Rome, 1993–2000)
Thes.	*Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* (Munich, 1900–)
Thes. Onom.	*Thesaurus Linguae Latinae Onomasticon* (Munich, 1907–)
TLO	*Totius Latinitatis Onomasticon* (Prati, 1859–)

Abbreviations for Latin works generally follow the conventions of *OLD*, though the following have been altered for greater clarity: Ov. *Her.* (*Heroides*) for Ov. *Ep.*; Lygd. (Lygdamus) for Tib. 3; Aug. *RG* (*Res Gestae*) for Aug. *Anc.* Abbreviations for Greek works are generally expanded forms of those found in Liddell, H.G., Scott, R. and Jones, H.S., *A Greek Lexicon* (Oxford, 1940 [ninth edition]). Abbreviations for periodicals follow those in *L'Année Philologique.* Except where it might cause ambiguity, references to the first book of Ovid's *Fasti* are by line number only; to other books of *Fasti*, by book and line number; to other works of Ovid, by text, book and line number. In all references to Latin text, the consonantal 'u' has been replaced with 'v'.

Text Used

The text and apparatus criticus for *Fasti* are taken from the Teubner edition by Alton, E., Wormell, D. and Courtney, E. *Ovidius Fasti* (1988). Differences in textual reading between my Commentary and the Teubner edition are given below:

Fasti 1	Teubner	This edition
74	*turba*	*lingua*
148	*plura*	*pauca*
264	*per*	*et*
305	*mentis*	*nostris*
452	*Idaliis*	*in calidis*
454	*Inachioti*	*Inachi lauta*
474	*vero . . . plena*	*pleno . . . vera*
524	*obruit*	*obruet*
639	*prospiciens*	*prospicies*
640	† *nunc* †	*nunc*
688	*ulla*	*aegra*
705	*praecidit*	*praecedet*

INTRODUCTION, I

EXPECTATION AND RE-EVALUATION IN OVID, *FASTI* 1

What is Ovid's poem *Fasti* about, and what influences, literary, historical and political, have been brought to bear upon it? In the light of a greater interest in the status of the text as a work of poetry, and a better understanding of both the discourse of the Augustan period and the complex nature of Roman religion, the past twenty-five years have seen numerous scholars put forward some detailed and compelling answers to these questions.[1] So far, however, these questions have been answered by considering the *totality* of the poem (as we possess it); they have not yet been posed with specific attention to Book 1, logically the first book encountered by the reader, and the first place where tentative answers may be formed. Such a 'reader-centric' approach to these questions may be all the more interesting when we consider that first impressions are not always accurate.

My approach in this chapter will be as follows. First, I will assess the likely expectations raised by a first reading of the introductory section of Book 1 (1–62). I will then assess how far these expectations are met by the rest of the book, and how far the reader is invited to go back and re-evaluate the information presented in this introductory section. Though this approach is necessarily subjective, it is ventured, in part, as a corrective to a general tendency to treat the introductory section as an immediately-accessible key to the poem as a whole.[2] As will become clear, I argue that Ovid's strategy in

---

[1] For detailed (and diverse) general discussions of the nature of the poem and the various cultural influences upon it, see Miller (1991) 8–43 (poetics and religious rites); Herbert-Brown (1994) 1–31 (esp. on the significance of the calendrical framework); Newlands (1995) 1–26; Barchiesi (1997) 1–11; Fantham (1998) 1–42; Gee (2000) 9–65 (on the astronomical material); Boyle/Woodard (2000) xxxiv–liv; Miller (2002). For detailed reviews of the recent scholarship, see Miller (1992a) and Fantham (1995a), (1995b).

[2] I am particularly sceptical of a general tendency to interpret lines 1–2 as an immediately-accessible signpost to generic affiliation: it is often suggested that a conceptual jump be made from *causis* (1) to Callimachus' *Aetia* and, from here, to a general understanding of *Fasti* as a 'Callimachean' work; similarly, it is suggested that Ovid's pledge to deal with the rising and setting of stars (2) be understood principally

the introductory section is in fact one of playful deception: some accurate information is given in a first reading; additional clues are only apparent in a re-reading, in the light of the rest of Book 1 and the poem as a whole; some information, however, appears to be just plain misleading. As such, Ovid's introductory section turns out to be just as deceptive as some of the prologues to his earlier works.[3]

First Impressions

In the first book of the poem, the reader could reasonably expect some sort of 'introduction' to the poem as a whole and clues as to its thematic and stylistic priorities. As expected, before dealing with the first day of the year, the poem offers a detailed introductory section (1–62) which gives out information about subject-matter and arrangement of material, and, in a less direct manner, offers clues as to the manner of treatment.[4] Ovid starts the poem with a confident pledge (1–2):

> *tempora cum causis Latium digesta per annum*
> *lapsaque sub terras ortaque signa canam.*

Ovid suggests a dual focus for *Fasti*. The first line deals with humanly-constructed time as measured by the calendar, the medium in which 'times are arranged throughout the Latin year': Ovid claims to sing about the 'festival occasions' (*tempora*) and the reasons behind them (*causis*). The second line deals with natural time as measured by the rising and setting of the constellations. Given the order of thought here, we are surely meant to understand by this that it is the Roman

as an affiliation to Aratus; see e.g. Miller (1991) 8–9, Herbert-Brown (1994) 9–10, Barchiesi (1997) 51, Newlands (2002) 202–3. Certainly, on reading the poem, we are strongly reminded of the influence of both Hellenistic poets; but I find such conceptual jumps unrealistic on a first reading of the opening couplet.

[3] Ovid starts *Amores* with the word *arma*, deceptively giving the impression that he is composing an epic through association with Vergil's *Aeneid*; see McKeown on *Am.* 1.1.1–2. The prologue to *Metamorphoses* (1.1–4) is a constant exercise in re-evaluation; see esp. Wheeler (1999) 8–30. It should also be pointed out that deception seems to be a key part of the introductory poem of Ovid's immediate model for *Fasti*, the fourth book of Propertius: though the reader is promised an antiquarian meditation on sacred rites, days and the ancient names of places (Prop. 4.1.69), Book 4 as a whole amounts to something quite different; see Commentary, 1–2 (v) n.

[4] I limit myself here to a discussion of the claims made for *Fasti* in lines 1–62. For a more detailed discussion of these lines, see Commentary ad loc.

calendar which will be the governing framework for the poem, and that comment on the rising and setting of stars will be subordinate to and integrated into this framework.[5] In accordance with the dominant calendrical framework, due emphasis, we are later told, will be put on the *festa domestica* (9–16), the newly-established festival days which celebrate the achievements of the Julian household;[6] cf. *nos Caesaris aras/et quoscumque sacris addidit ille dies* (13–14), *adnue conanti per laudes ire tuorum* (15). Such a grand and elaborate enterprise clearly demands a lot of research on the part of the poet, and Ovid is keen to declare that the poem is indeed a work of antiquarian investigation; cf. *sacra recognosces annalibus eruta priscis* (7). The first twenty-six lines, then, give us some strong indications as to the poem's underlying structure, themes, imperial focus and antiquarian nature.

With these claims made, and before dealing with specific dates in the year, Ovid gives the reader a general background to the make-up of the Roman year. We are presented first with a brief history of the formation of the year by Romulus and Numa (27–44); next comes an introduction to the different rules governing different days in the month, which inform a Roman whether it is appropriate to conduct business or observe a particular rite (45–60). This explanatory section is very concisely structured, offering the reader orderly guidance on the set-up of the year (27–38), followed by the months (39–44) and finally the individual days (45–60). The informative nature of this

[5] The centrality of the calendar as a governing framework for the poem has been challenged in recent years; see Rüpke (1994), Barchiesi (1997) 103–4. But we should be careful, in the first instance, not to interpret the introductory section in the light of the rest of the poem. In the introduction, it is evident that much greater emphasis is placed on the festivals and the composition of the Roman year (9–12, 27–60) than the stars (2). Ovid's pledge to sing of the 'rising and setting of constellations' suggests, most naturally in the context of lines 1–2, a process of *dating*: but rather than seasonal or relative stellar dating (as in Hesiod and Aratus), Ovid will tie them to the dates of the Roman calendar. Moreover, the poem's official title, either *Fasti* or *libri Fastorum* (Rüpke (1994) 125–9), stresses the centrality of the calendar. It may be that, when reading the poem, we feel that Ovid's claims in lines 1–2 turn out to be misleading (see below), but there is no reason to question his integrity at this early stage; for a reaffirming of the importance of the calendar framework for the poem, see Wheeler (1999) 45–7.

[6] These remarks, addressed to Germanicus, are part of a revised, post-Augustan edition of the poem; for the complexities of revision, see Introduction, II. There is no reason, however, to cast doubt on its programmatic force for the entire poem: a specific pledge to deal with *festa domestica* would undoubtedly have formed part of the original prologue to Augustus.

section, as well as its orderly structure, intimates that *Fasti* will be a didactic poem,[7] with the poet cast in the role of teacher/informer. Ovid's didactic stance is particularly noticeable in this section in a series of addresses which demonstrate a concern to guide his 'students'; cf. *ne tamen ignores variorum iura dierum* (45), *nec toto perstare die sua iura putaris* (49), *ne fallare cave* (58). Finally, in the last lines of the introduction (61–2), Ovid claims to have relayed all this information now so that he might not be 'forced to break the sequence of things': *ne seriem rerum scindere cogar* (62 with Commentary n.). The phrase *series rerum* has a solemn Lucretian feel, and gives the impression that the adoption of a calendar framework dictates, for Ovid, a strict arrangement of material and schedule which ought not to be interrupted by such menial general information once it is in progress. Ovid may be, at this stage, suggesting that he will follow the order of one specific calendar, possibly the magnificent inscription of the calendar at Praeneste recently completed by Verrius Flaccus (c. A.D. 6).

In summary, the reader would be justified in coming away from the introductory section (1–62) with a series of expectations for *Fasti* as a whole. Thematically, the poem will deal with the festival days of the Roman year and the reasons behind them; an important additional theme will be the rising and setting of stars. As for the framework, the poem will follow the structural dictates of the Roman calendar. Stylistically, the poem will take a didactic form, with the poet cast as teacher, versed in antiquarian matters.

Should the reader have, at this stage, any reservations about the integrity of Ovid's introduction? Possibly. The reader will have noticed, by line 2, that *Fasti* is an *elegiac* poem. Traditionally suited to lighter themes of love and lament, the reader might feel an early tension between Ovid's grand thematic claims and the metre with which he has chosen to operate. That said, the reader has no firm ideas as to how this tension will be played out.[8] The reader may also have noticed, especially in lines 1–14, a general similarity in thematic intent to the first poem of Propertius' fourth book, a very important immediate predecessor for Ovid; see Commentary, 1–2 (v) n. But again, Ovid's intertextual dialogue with Propertius 4.1 in the introductory section gives little away as to the nature of Ovid's poem as a whole.

[7] See Commentary, 27–62n.

[8] For Ovid's regular claims to generic norms for elegy, which only point up his creative transgression of them, see esp. Hinds (1987), (1992), Miller (2002) 181–2, Harrison (2002) 85–6; also Commentary, 13–14n.

Ovid's handling of the month of January

With these expectations in mind, it is time to look in more detail at the structure and subject-matter of the rest of Book 1, which covers the month of January:[9]

***Fasti* 1**	**Date**	**Event**	**Content/Manner of Treatment**
63–288	*1st January*	new consuls go to the Capitol	dialogue with the god Janus, who appears before the poet and answers a variety of questions pertaining to the god himself and the first day of the year
289–94	*1st January*	temples of Jupiter and Aesculapius	—
295–310	—	—	a eulogy to astronomers and their wisdom
311–14	*3rd January*	Crab constellation disappears	—
315–16	*5th January*	Lyre constellation appears	—
317–456	*9th January*	Agonalia	speculation as to the etymology of the word Agonalia leads into a detailed history of animal sacrifice from the post-Golden Age onwards
457–8	*9th January*	Dolphin constellation appears	—
459–60	*10th January*	Midwinter	—
461–586	*11th January*	Carmentalia (I)	Carmentis' arrival into Italy with her son Evander; Carmentis' prophecy of the future of Rome; the battle between Hercules and Cacus, leading to the foundation of the Ara Maxima

[9] The information presented below is for present purposes of guidance only, and details at face-value what Ovid says. The different ways of interpreting individual passages are discussed in the relevant parts of the Commentary.

Table (*cont.*)

Fasti 1	Date	Event	Content/Manner of Treatment
587–616	*13th January*	the title 'Augustus' conferred on the Emperor	a eulogy to the bearer of the title 'Augustus', which is favourably compared to titles conferred on others in the past
617–36	*15th January*	Carmentalia (II)	the origin of the goddess' role in childbirth is traced back to an event involving the Roman matrons' abstention from childbirth
637–50	*16th January*	temple of Concord dedicated by Tiberius (A.D. 10)	the Tiberian dedication to Concord is favourably compared to the one (apparently) dedicated by Camillus
651–2	*17th January*	change of sign from Capricorn to Aquarius	—
653–4	*23rd January*	Lyre constellation disappears	—
655–6	*24th January*	Lion constellation disappears	—
657–704	—	Feriae Sementivae	dramatised festival in which the narrator leads rustic prayers for successful growth of the crop
705–8	*27th January*	temple of Castor and Pollux dedicated (A.D. 6)	—
709–24	*30th January*	Altar of Pax Augusta dedicated (13 B.C.)	a eulogy to Pax Augusta

On the basis of this overview, we can reasonably attempt to assess whether Book 1 lives up to the claims made in the introductory sec-

tion.[10] We soon find that the expectations raised in the introductory section are challenged.

The first thing to strike us, especially in light of the 'undated/undatable' elements of Book 1 such as the Eulogy to Astronomers and the Feriae Sementivae, is that, contrary to what was hinted at in lines 61–2, Ovid's calendar proves not to be *entirely* restrictive when it comes to subject-matter and arrangement of material. In order to understand why this is the case, we need at this point to assess the nature and significance of the official publicly-displayed calendars (*fasti*) whose central framework Ovid claims to follow. From the remaining fragments of these calendars, collected in Degrassi (1963), it is apparent that they were by no means detailed religious documents; on the contrary, they often do little more than attest that a particular festival takes place on a certain day. The calendars never detail the proceedings of a given festival, and only in one calendar—the extraordinary *Fasti Praenestini* of Verrius Flaccus—is there any discussion as to the reasons behind the festivals noted. Moreover, analysis of the calendars clearly suggests that there was no uniform, officially-recognised model on which different calendars were based: discrepancies and differences of opinion abound.[11] At best, these calendars must have acted as aide-memoires for the literate at Rome.

This 'failure' on the part of the calendars to disclose the finer details behind the festivals is symptomatic of the nature of Roman religion in general. In recent years, there has emerged a greater understanding of the unique way in which Roman religion operates compared to other religions. Roman religion was not based on any primary, readily-accessible religious document which might explain the true origin

[10] Though the text of Book 1 was revised after the death of Augustus (see Introduction, II), there is no reason to suggest that Book 1 is any less representative of the poem as a whole in terms of variety of style, theme and manner of treatment. We owe it to the genius of Ovid that a revised Book 1 may be read as a coherent part of the poem; see Barchiesi (1997) 89.

[11] This can be easily demonstrated by looking, for example, at the entry for 30th January in two remaining calendars of about the same time, the *Fasti Caeretani* (c. 12 B.C.) and the *Fasti Maffeiani* (c. 8 B.C.) [Degrassi 65, 72]: though they are both composed after the foundation of the Ara Pacis (13 B.C.), the former calendar includes the festival, marking the day as *fastus*, whereas the latter omits it, marking the day as *nefastus*. Adding to the discrepancies, later calendars which note the festival mark the day as NP (most likely *nefastus parte*): cf. *Fasti Praenestini* and *Fasti Verulani* [Degrassi 116, 161].

of customs and the significance behind the festival days.[12] As a result, Roman religion proved to be a very dynamic organism. With no orthodox religious interpretations of a given festival, the significance behind it was subject to change through time, particularly in the hands of the Emperors, who imposed their own (political) significance on days at will.[13] Consequently, in contemplating the reason behind a particular festival, the responsibility fell to the informed individual to work out for himself the most appropriate explanation. This inevitably led to a wide variety of popular interpretations for a given custom, and it is this whole collection of variant interpretations which ultimately constitutes the Roman religious experience.[14]

The calendar, then, was not a prescriptive document, and Roman religion, owing to its inherent mutability, called upon the intellectual public for their own particular interpretations concerning the significance behind the festivals. Ovid is fully aware of this and responds to the call in his own unique way, making full use of the versatility that the calendar offered. First, like the public calendars, Ovid feels that he has a degree of selectivity as to what he may include in his treatment of the month of January. Particularly noticeable by its absence is any mention of Octavian's assumption of *imperium* on 7th January (43 B.C.).[15] But even with the material that he does decide to include, Ovid exercises a certain amount of licence. For example, when a festival extends over more than one day, Ovid can choose to deal with each of the days (as with the Carmentalia, 461–586, 617–36), or just the first (e.g. Megalensia, 4.179–372) or the last (e.g. Dies Parentalis, 2.533–70). Ovid records Octavian's assumption of the title 'Augustus' under his entry for 13th January—rather than the generally-accepted 16th or 17th January—in order to achieve a particular rhetorical effect (see Commentary, 590n.). More startling is the fact that Ovid chooses to relate the circumstances surrounding Hercules' foundation of the Ara

[12] For the most important contributions to the issue, see Beard (1987), Scheid (1992), BNP and Feeney (1998); for an overview of the new scholarship, see Feeney (1998) 1–11.

[13] See especially Beard (1987) 3ff. for the change in significance through time of the festival on 21st April, known in Ovid's day as the Parilia; see also BNP I.5ff.

[14] See Scheid (1992) 122–4.

[15] The event is mentioned in both the *Feriale Cumanum* (Degrassi 279) and, more significantly, the famous *Fasti Praenestini* (Degrassi 113). The omissions in *Fasti*, and possible reasons for them, are analysed in detail by Syme (1978) 23–9; Syme's work in this area is criticised by Herbert-Brown (1994) 215–33.

Maxima under his entry for 11th January, even though the festival of Hercules at the Ara Maxima was in fact celebrated on 12th August (see Commentary, 543–82 (ii) n.). Finally, the Feriae Sementivae was an agricultural festival of no fixed date which, like other 'moveable festivals', had no place in the public calendars; it was, rather, appointed each year by the priests, and may have occurred as early as December (see Commentary, 657–704 (i) n., 659–60n.). Consequently, Ovid's placement of the festival at some point between 24th and 27th January, and indeed his inclusion of it at all, are purely personal choices (see Commentary, 657–704 (iii) n.).

So Ovid takes advantage of the dynamic nature of the official calendars to exercise a certain amount of choice. For the most part, however, the calendar framework does encourage Ovid to deal with the important festivals commemorated on the individual days in January as they occur in the official calendars. Nevertheless, for the reasons explained above, the calendar did not dictate in any way the *manner* in which Ovid should deal with a given festival. Ovid displays a wide variety of 'starting points' for his religious enquiries: for example, the section on the Agonalia is primarily set in motion by an etymology, the Carmentalia by an enquiry into the nature of the goddess, and the Feriae Sementivae by the ritual proceedings of the festival itself. Different starting points inevitably lead into different styles of treatment. Indeed, one of the most prominent features of Book 1 is the demonstrable variety of styles or 'genres' adopted: we are presented with a lively conversational exchange (89–282), moralistic denunciation of vice (191–222), erotic comedy (391–440), epic narrative (461–586), *consolatio* (479–96), imperial eulogy (587–616, 709–24) and religious mimesis (663–704). Even within particular sections, Ovid is keen to exhibit a variety of styles. Particularly notable is the history of sacrifice during the treatment of the Agonalia (317–456), in which the story pertaining to each animal is told in a different narrative mode (see Commentary, 349–52n.). It is evident that Ovid takes on the language, motif and style of the particular genre he is currently imitating, often attaching his piece to the genre by pointed allusion to a notable predecessor. For example, the first section on the Carmentalia (461–586) is essentially epic in theme and diction, recalling Vergil's *Aeneid* specifically; the mimetic representation of the Feriae Sementivae recalls in theme, style and diction Vergil's *Georgics*, Tibullus 2.1 and, through these, the mimetic Hymns of Callimachus.

In fact, it is during the course of reading Book 1 that *Fasti*'s status as a *poetic text*, rather than a calendar, achieves its full force. It is not only the sheer variety of styles in Book 1 which emphasises the poetic nature of the work and takes us away from the calendar framework. Clarity of dating in the Roman year—so important to the official calendars—is noticeably lacking in Ovid's poem. First, the manner in which Ovid registers a particular date is often ambiguous.[16] Secondly, Ovid often refers to dates in a form relative to others, making it difficult for the reader to ascertain the actual day which is being described. For example, starting with a direct reference to 15th January ("two days after the Ides" (617)), the chronological sequence for the next four entries is as follows: "on the next day" (637); "when these events have passed" (651); "when the sixth day from this has set" (653); "on the coming night" (655). Thirdly, Ovid's chronological references are often highly stylised and ingenious—e.g. "when the next bride of Tithonus has left her husband" (literal translation, 461)—which further obfuscate meaning.[17] All this suggests that we may be doing Ovid a disservice by punctuating his text with calendar-date notation sub-headings:[18] on the contrary, the poet's deliberate blurring of divisions invites (complex) *continuous* readings of the poem.[19]

Contrary to lines 61–2, then, the calendar does not always dictate the material and its ordering; in fact, it is the potential versatility of the calendar which goes some way to explaining why such a framework might have appealed to Ovid. As for the manner of treatment of the festival days, this has proven most varied. Were we given any advance notice of this variety in the introductory section? It is at this point that we might go back and, in the light of Book 1, reinterpret the seemingly-innocent *causis* (1) as an allusion to Callimachus: as a translation of the title of Callimachus' famous work on the origin of customs, *Aetia*, the opening couplet does perhaps alert us to a treatment

[16] See Commentary, 311–12n.

[17] For other ingenious chronological links, see Commentary, 461n., 617n., 653n.

[18] Adopted first by Merkel (Berlin, 1841), it has been the standard practice of editors ever since.

[19] For the special challenge of a continuous reading of the poem, connecting what is, at face-value, disconnected, see Newlands (1995) 17, (2000); Barchiesi (1997) 73ff. esp. 86. For continuous readings in Book 1, see Commentary, 457–8n., 650n., 657–704 (iii) n.; see also Barchiesi (1997) 92–9, Pasco-Pranger (2002) 260–73. Moreover, in a forthcoming publication, Barbara Weiden Boyd sets out a suggestive eulogistic reading of the whole of Book 1; I am grateful to her for an advance draft of this.

of festivals which owes a great deal to Ovid's Hellenistic predecessor; see Commentary, 1–2 (i) n. Let us now consider the other claims made in the introduction.

Is Book 1 really about festival days and the reasons behind them, as Ovid suggests in the first line (*tempora cum causis*)? An analysis of Book 1 reveals that we are invited to witness the occasion of only a limited number of festivals, most notably the Feriae Sementivae (663–94), which takes the form of a mimetic performance.[20] But even here, a certain amount of poetic embellishment naturally prevents too literal an interpretation of the proceedings at this festival. As for the other major festivals evoked in Book 1—most notably the Agonalia and the Carmentalia—we learn little of the manner in which they are celebrated. In the light of Book 1, we might be tempted to re-evaluate the full extent of the first word of the poem, *tempora*. Not simply covering the festival 'times' of the Roman year, as suggested by the immediate grammatical context of line 1, *tempora* covers time which is mythical (e.g. 461–586, Carmentis and Evander), historical (e.g. 621–8, the repeal of the Lex Oppia c. 200 B.C.), contemporary (e.g. 637–50, Tiberius' dedication of the Temple to Concord, A.D. 10) and even 'eternal' (the stars).

As regards the reasons behind these festivals, analysis of Book 1 again reveals only partial fulfilment of the pledge. For example, we are given the reasons behind Carmentis' place in the calendar in terms of her pivotal contribution to the history of Rome (617–36). However, the section on the Agonalia (317–456) gives us not the reason behind the specific festival itself, but the reasons behind the sacrifice of different animals; the centrepiece narrative of this section, the elaborate story of Priapus and Lotis (393–440), takes us far away from any enquiry about the Agonalia. *causis* (1), then, might need to be reinterpreted in a more general sense to cover all manner of 'origins'.

We turn now to the claim, made in lines 9–16, to celebrate the Julian household. There are certainly sections in Book 1 which appear at face-value to be favourable to the Julian household through three generations: a eulogy to the bearer of the title 'Augustus' (587–616); Augustus' institution of Pax Augusta as memorialised in the Ara Pacis (709–24); Tiberius' dedication of the temple of Concord (637–50); a

[20] The other festival proceedings described include the consuls' procession to the Capitol on 1st January (75–88) and the Carmentalia, where insight is offered into the names one might hear at the festival (631–6).

celebration of the present peace secured by Germanicus (63–70, 285–6). But Ovid's style and choice of theme regularly allow for more critical readings of these imperial achievements.[21] For example, Ovid's decision to praise Augustan Peace within a framework usually reserved for the praising of idealised peace might be felt to draw attention to the 'unreality' of the Pax Augusta; see Commentary, 709–22 (ii) n. The flattering tribute to the marital harmony of Augustus and Livia, divinised as Jupiter and Juno, is perhaps undercut by a contiguous reference to Ganymede, one of many individuals who incited infidelity in Jupiter; see Commentary, 650n. Perhaps more worryingly, Ovid's condemnatory stance towards animal sacrifice (see Commentary, 349–456n.) sits awkwardly in a poem apparently composed to celebrate Caesar's altars (13), the very location of animal sacrifice.

Other information in the introductory section turns out to be misleading. Ovid's treatment of the constellations in the poem is not confined to a simple charting of their rising and setting, as suggested in line 2. Though there are no examples in Book 1, Ovid often deals with the mythical stories surrounding the origin of the stars. This forces a certain amount of reinterpretation of the introductory couplet in hindsight: first, in addition to festivals, *tempora cum causis* (1) is meant to cover eternal time, as measured by the stars, and the mythical causes behind them; secondly, we might be encouraged to read line 2 as a stylistic rather than strictly thematic marker, as an indication of generic affiliation to a sophisticated Hellenistic stellar tradition, especially Aratus; see Commentary, 311–14 (ii) n. Contrary to the emerging didactic persona of the introductory section, Ovid does not see himself primarily as teacher: his persona changes throughout the

[21] The past two decades have seen the establishment of, broadly speaking, three critically-opposed camps. One camp asserts that Ovid's praise of Augustan institution is both consistent and unproblematic; see McKeown (1984); Fantham (1985), (1995b) 49–52; Herbert-Brown (1994). In direct opposition, the second camp asserts that Ovid speaks in a deliberately ambiguous manner, undercutting the optimistic Augustan programme and exposing fissures in its discourse; see esp. Barchiesi (1991), (1997); Hinds (1992); Newlands (1995); Boyle (2003) 29–35, 44–53. The third camp takes a different approach: it acknowledges the unsettled, 'polyphonic' nature of the poem, but denies that such opposing voices question or undercut each other; see Miller (1991) 139–41, (2002) 170; Toohey (1996) 124–45. Though it may be valid to view such multiple voices as a reflection of either Callimachean poetics or Roman religious discourse, it is difficult to see how religious polyphony could have been devoid of political implication: was it not precisely this sort of disharmony that Augustus was trying to harmonise? My overall impression of Book 1 and the poem as a whole, though not a totalising view, comes closest to the second camp.

poem to that of, for example, interviewer/student (89–282) and Master of Ceremony (see Commentary, 657–704 (ii) n.).[22] The reasons behind the organisation of the year and the naming of the months, apparently clear-cut in the introductory section (27–44), emerge as much more problematic during the poem.[23] Finally, it becomes clear that much of the content of Book 1 has not been amassed from a consultation of primary ancient sources, as suggested in line 7, but from a variety of more contemporary prose and poetic works.[24] It is significant that, in his treatment of the first day of the year, Ovid conducts an interview between himself and Janus, in a manner reminiscent of Callimachus' *Aetia*, before concluding the section with a brief mention of the information he has been able to glean from the calendars themselves; cf. *quod tamen ex ipsis licuit mihi discere fastis* (289). Early in his poem, then, Ovid serves notice not only that the 'official' sources are of limited use in the collecting of religious information (note the restrictive *licuit*) but also that he is more inclined towards literary imitation and innovation than sifting through ancient documents.

To summarise, a reading of *Fasti*, and even just Book 1, reveals that the introductory section (1–62) does as much to deceive as to inform. A first reading of these lines may offer some reliable information regarding the poem's thematic outlook; a re-reading of the section (especially the opening couplet) in the light of the rest of Book 1 may offer some allusive additional clues as to literary affiliation and style. Ultimately, however, the introductory section will only take us so far, however many times we return to it. So can we find a satisfactory

---

[22] For the didactic façade of *Fasti*, see Commentary, 27–62n.

[23] See especially the apparent controversy surrounding the reason for Romulus' institution of a ten-month year (Commentary, 33–4n.) and the significance behind the naming of May and June (Commentary, 41n.). In fact, there is deception even within the introductory section itself: information on the apparent predictability of the religious status of days is 'corrected' as soon as it is given; see 47–52 with nn.

[24] Ovid sporadically gives the impression of sifting through ancient sources such as calendars; see Commentary, 657n. For most of the information concerning festivals and aetiology/etymology, however, Ovid was able to draw on the wealth of antiquarian material collected in such (now fragmentary) works as Ennius' *Annales*, Cato's *Origines* and the treatises of late-Republican/early-Empire intellectuals such as Varro (*De Lingua Latina*, *Antiquitates rerum Divinarum* and *De Vita Populi Romani*), Nigidius Figulus (*De Dis* and *Comentarii Grammatici*) and Verrius Flaccus (*De Significatione Verborum*); see Rawson (1985) 233–49. For the various traditions followed for his treatment of the stars, see Commentary, 311–14 (ii) n. For the important poetic influences, see Commentary, 1–2n. The individual source influences in Book 1 are detailed throughout the Commentary, but for general surveys, see Peeters (1939) 49–63, Wilkinson (1955) 243–4, Harries (1989) 164–5, Fantham (1998) 4–36, Green (2002).

answer to our initial question: 'What is *Fasti* about?' Certainly, the poem deals with festivals and the reasons behind them, stars and a celebration of the Julian household through its commemorative dates; it is certainly in some sense didactic and born out of research; and it certainly, at times, acts as a window onto the complex world of Roman religious experience. However, none of these on their own—nor indeed all of them put together—tell the full story of what *Fasti* is about. It would be more appropriate to venture, on the basis of the analysis above, that *Fasti* is essentially about Ovid, ingenious poet and savvy critic of Augustan discourse, working within the versatile framework of the calendar, and the intricate range of choices he makes in terms of theme, order, selectivity, style and tone, and the subsequent range of readings this creates. The poem's essence is perhaps best captured by Newlands [(1995) 12]:

> If the revised Roman calendar expresses what it meant to be Roman in an official sense, then Ovid's version of the calendar represents what it meant to be Ovidian—that is urbane, sophisticated, well versed in Hellenistic literary tradition, and the questioner and challenger of artistic, historical, and political authority.

INTRODUCTION, II

TEXTUAL AND TEMPORAL IN *FASTI* 1: EXILE, REVISION AND THE READER

Anyone embarking on a study of Ovid's *Fasti*, and Book 1 in particular, must come to terms with the fact that the text of the poem was 'continued', 'updated' and, in some cases, 'revised' by the poet whilst he was in exile.[1] This has traditionally prompted scholars to ponder additional questions when analysing the poem. Which parts of the text are pre-exilic and which parts post-exilic? Why did Ovid choose to revise certain parts of the text? To what extent has this revision taken place, and what is the implication of this for our understanding of the poem as we possess it? The following chapter, whilst not claiming to solve an insoluble issue, will invite us to reflect on our methodology and consider different and potentially more fruitful approaches to the problem.

a. *The Case for Revision*

As a starting point, we should consider the evidence on whose basis scholars have traditionally argued for revision of the text. In an apparently autobiographical note to Augustus from exile (A.D. 9),[2] Ovid outlines the history of composition of *Fasti* (*Tr.* 2.549–52):

> *sex ego Fastorum scripsi totidemque libellos,*
> *cumque suo finem mense libellus habet,*
> *idque tuo nuper scriptum sub nomine, Caesar,*
> *et tibi sacratum sors mea rupit opus;*

[1] Clarity of terminology is crucial in discussions of the text of *Fasti*. For the purposes of this section, I use 'continue' to refer to the poet's (politically neutral) continuation of *Fasti* from where he left off on the last occasion; I use 'update' to refer to the poet's going back and adding to or changing his existing material without political motivation; I use 'revise' to refer to the inclusion of new material, or reworking of existing material, to take into account the changing political situation at Rome. Quite separate from these are the terms 'pre-exilic' and 'post-exilic', which I use purely in the temporal sense, i.e. A.D. 2–8 and A.D. 9–17 respectively.

[2] For the dating of *Tr.* 2, see Syme (1978) 38, Williams (1994) 182.

In the light of the extant poem, these lines have long intrigued scholars. First, it is most naturally suggested by *sex* . . . *totidemque* (549) that Ovid actually had all twelve books of *Fasti* in some sort of written form, which leaves us to ponder why we only possess the first six books.[3] But for our present purposes, it is lines 551–2 which are the more interesting. Ovid suggests that his lot 'interrupted' (*rupit*) the poem, which must refer principally to his forced exile to Tomis in late A.D. 8. More significantly, Ovid claims to have dedicated the work to his present addressee, Augustus (the identity of the Caesar of 551)). This is immediately at odds with the extant poem, since the proem to Book 1 (3–26) establishes Germanicus as the patron and literary inspiration for *Fasti*. If we are correct to take Ovid's claims at *Tr.* 2.549–52 at face-value, we are left to ponder at what time and for what reason this change in dedicatee took place.

The most popular theory is that Ovid revised from exile the original dedication of *Fasti* for personal reasons, at some time after the composition of *Tristia* 2.[4] The traditional reconstruction of events is as follows. Ovid began work on *Fasti* during the early years A.D.[5] By

[3] Some believe that, by the time of his exile in A.D. 8, Ovid had the first six books in a reasonably finished state, and the last six in a much rougher form. At some stage, it is suggested, the draft of the last six books was deemed non-publishable, either by Ovid or a later editor, and subsequently lost; see e.g. Peeters (1939) 63ff., Tarrant (1983) 266. Others maintain that Ovid never progressed beyond Book 6; see Bömer (1957) 17, 20–2; Feeney (1992) 14ff. [the work is deliberately unfinished as a mute protest to Augustus]; Newlands (1995) 124–45 [the mirroring of themes in Books 1 and 6 suggests that the existing poem was conceived as a whole]. Additional couplets attached to some MSS at the end of Book 6, and a curious note at Serv. *G.* 1.43, can be discounted as evidence for a written form of the last six books of the poem; see Peeters (1939) 72–5, AWC v–vi; but note the wonderful spoof about the coming of Father Christmas on 24th December, edited by Kovacs (1993)!

[4] The view that the original proem to Augustus was simply moved from Book 1 to the beginning of Book 2 (3–18) has now been convincingly challenged; see esp. Fantham (1985) 256–8, Miller (1991) 143–4.

[5] The standard view is that Ovid began work on the poem from A.D. 1–2 onwards, composing it contemporaneously with his other major poem, *Metamorphoses*; see e.g. Bömer (1957) 15–17, Otis (1970) 21–2, Williams (1978) 56, Hinds (1987) 10–11, Fantham (1998) 2–3, Holzberg (2002) 39, White (2002) 14; for counter views of the dating of the first edition of *Fasti*, see Fränkel (1945) 143 [poem written in A.D. 7–8]; Syme (1978) 21ff., 30ff. [challenged by Herbert-Brown (1994) 215ff.] who claims that, apart from obvious post-exilic insertions, the poem was composed between A.D. 1–4. Attempts to determine the relative chronology of the many comparable episodes in *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*, in terms of either composition date or publication date, have, however, proven inconclusive; see esp. Bömer (1988). We might do best to follow Hinds [(1987) 10–11, 42–4, 72–7] who stresses the *mutual dependence* of episodes in both poems: in whichever order we read the two poems, we are encouraged, even required, to cross-reference. For the possibility that we are encouraged to read *Metamorphoses* first followed by *Fasti*, see Commentary, 1–2 (iv) n.

A.D. 8, he had at least the first six books in a reasonably finished form when he was exiled from Rome, an event which temporarily halted work on the poem. In his early years of exile, he turned his hand to *Tristia* and *Epistulae Ex Ponto*, in which he consistently claims that there was no conscious wrong-doing involved in the 'crime' that led to his exile,[6] and appeals to leading figures at Rome to act on his behalf to help secure his return. But following the death of Augustus in A.D. 14, Ovid felt that his *Fasti*, on which he may have been steadily continuing work since A.D. 8,[7] might also be able to play a part in this attempt to return home. To this end, he started to revise the existing poem, such that the focus was shifted away from Augustus to other prominent (and potentially sympathetic) members of the imperial household, namely Livia, Augustus' widow (see Commentary, 515–36 (ii), (iii) n.) and Germanicus, the adopted grandson of Augustus who was becoming increasingly successful (see Commentary, 3–26n.).[8]

Considerable backing for this theory may be discovered in one of Ovid's exilic epistles to Suillius Rufus (*Pont.* 4.8), dated to A.D. 15–16.[9] In this letter, Ovid asks his addressee to supplicate Germanicus on his behalf in an attempt to secure either a return from exile or, at the very least, a milder sentence. In return for this, Ovid specifically promises to praise the achievements of Germanicus in verse;[10] cf. *Pont.* 4.8.31–4 *Germanice... Naso suis opibus, carmine, gratus erit*, 65–6 *siquid adhuc igitur vivi, Germanice, nostro/restat in ingenio, serviet omne tibi.* It is obviously tempting to see this remark as anticipating the newly-revised version of *Fasti* as we possess it.[11]

---

[6] The exact nature of Ovid's 'crime', which is never specifically disclosed but is most famously alluded to at *Tr.* 2.207—*carmen et error* ('a poem and a mistake')—is still a matter for debate; for detailed analysis, see Thibault (1964), Verdière (1992).

[7] See below.

[8] The relative absence of Tiberius is noticeable in any revision, especially as he was the one person after Augustus' death with the immediate power to recall the poet; for the particularly surprising silence on Augustus' adoption of Tiberius as imperial successor on 26th June, A.D. 4, see Herbert-Brown (1994) 229–33, Newlands (1995) 220–5, Barchiesi (1997) 264–5; for the fleeting and downplayed references to Tiberius in Book 1, see Commentary, 10n. It suggests that the relationship between Tiberius and the poet was, at best, strained; see Herbert-Brown (1994) 181; for an alternative view that the relative absence of Tiberius in the poem may be proof that *Fasti* was composed largely between A.D. 1–4, see Syme (1978) 28–35.

[9] See Syme (1978) 89–90.

[10] This elaborates on an earlier pledge of Ovid's, at *Pont.* 2.1.63ff. (A.D. 13), to praise in verse Germanicus' involvement in the Pannonian triumph.

[11] This is further encouraged by the many details common to the two addresses to Germanicus in *Fasti* 1.3–26 and *Pont.* 4.8.31ff. (see Commentary, 3–26n.), and

b) *The Dynamics of Revision, Approach 1: Ovidian Intention and the Search for the Editor*

That a revision of the text has taken place is now generally accepted, and I see no reason to dispute it. What has continued to vex scholars, however, is the extent of this revision, particularly in Book 1.[12] The issue has so far largely been conducted in terms of an attempt to recover the editorial workings of the poet himself: commentators have tried to tease out the layers of composition in the extant poem in order to determine which parts are 'original' or 'revised', 'pre-exilic' or 'post-exilic', with varying degrees of success. We shall adopt this working strategy for a while and see how far it takes us in Book 1.[13]

	Phase I	*Phase II*	*Phase III*
Time Period	**A.D. 2–8**	**A.D. 9–14**	**A.D. 14–17**
	start of production until 'interruption' of exile	exile (under Augustus)	from death of Augustus to poet's own death[14]
Likely Reason for Working on Fasti	composing a poem which he intends to finish	'continuation' and/ or 'updating' of interrupted work	'revising' existing work to reflect the changing political situation at Rome

the possible allusion at *Pont.* 4.8.50–1—*nullaque res maius tempore robur habet./scripta ferunt annos*—where *tempore* may be taken as a reference to *Tempora* (first word of *Fasti* and common title for the poem) and the latter phrase translated as 'my writings bring you the (Roman) years'.

[12] It is still the general consensus that Book 1 shows the most extensive and coherent attempt to take into account the post-Augustan regime at Rome; outside this book, the only confident piece of post-Augustan revision comes in the form of a surprising interjection to Germanicus at 4.81–4. For suggestions of more extensive revision of the poem, however, see esp. Peeters (1939) 83–4, Fantham (1985) 266–73.

[13] In order to approach the issue in this way, one has to make choices and assumptions at even a basic level for which there is no real evidence. For the working purposes of this section, the following are my assumptions: the comment at *Tr.* 2.549–52 should be taken at face-value; Ovid was continuing work on *Fasti* during A.D. 8–14; in view of the comment at *Tr.* 2.551–2, Ovid would not have given such prominence to Germanicus while Augustus was still alive.

[14] Jerome (*Chron.* p.171 H.) records Ovid's death under the year A.D. 17, a date generally accepted by modern scholars, see e.g. Syme (1978) 47, Herbert-Brown (1994) 206, Holzberg (2002) 24, White (2002) 20.

First, it is important to realise that there are potentially three conceptually-distinct time phases for Book 1—the poem's first word, *tempora*, applies as much to the composition of the poem as to the themes within the poem itself:

Scholars now generally agree that Ovid was working on *Fasti* during Phases I and III.[15] Phase II is the most difficult to pin down. There is certainly no shortage of literary output from Ovid during this period: the five books of *Tristia* (A.D. 8–12), the curse-poem *Ibis* (not later than A.D. 12), and three books of *Epistulae ex Ponto* (A.D. 12–13).[16] It is, then, not unreasonable to assume that he continued work on *Fasti* as well during this period, even if not at the pace of before, but we can only surmise what it would have involved. Ovid may have simply continued and updated his 'interrupted' work on the poem; it is unlikely that he would, at this stage, have been revising the existing material to reflect the changing political situation at Rome. If we do accept that Ovid was working on *Fasti* during Phase II, we face the additional problem of distinguishing this from Phase III: where does the continuation of an existing project end and its strategic revision begin? The difference in motivation behind Phases II and III may be substantial, and we should be careful not to elide the two.[17]

We now have a working structure of phases and motivation in place; it is time to enter the text of Book 1 proper and see if we can assign parts of the text to any particular Phase. We might organise our findings in descending order of confidence:

---

[15] But see the more sceptical approach of Holzberg (2002) 37–8 regarding Phase III.

[16] For the dating of Ovid's exilic output, see Syme (1978) 37–47, Williams (2002) 338.

[17] For example, Newlands (1995) 5: "Having begun composition in approximately 2 A.D., he revised the extant poem considerably in the nine years of exile that preceded his death in Tomis in 17 A.D." What evidence is there for Phase II specifically? For many of those years, might not the poem have been *continued* rather than *revised*? Compare this with the similarly unqualified opposing view of Fantham (1998) 3: "What is *clear* [my emphasis] is that the exiled poet returned to the *Fasti* after the death of Augustus in A.D. 14". Why only Phase III?

i) *Strong Cases of Revision: Phase III*

In some instances, we can not only categorise something as 'revision', but also assign it to Phase III:

- The re-dedication of the poem to Germanicus (3–26): see above.
- References to Germanicus throughout Book 1, where the poet, it would seem, has attempted to integrate his new patron into sections with which he strictly has no connection; cf. 63–4 *ecce tibi faustum, Germanice, nuntiat annum . . . Ianus*, 285–6 *pax erat, et vestri, Germanice, causa triumphi, / tradiderat famulas iam tibi Rhenus aquas*, 589–90 *tuus Augusto nomine dictus avus* (Ovid telling Germanicus about 'his grandfather Augustus');
- Reference to Livia as Iulia Augusta, a title made public in Augustus' will (536 with 515–36 (iii) n.).

Most scholars are in agreement to this extent. Even though our findings are not entirely foolproof—there is nothing to say, for example, that Livia's new name was not public knowledge long before Augustus' death—we can be quietly confident here.

ii) *Strong Cases for Post-Exilic Work: either Phase II or III*

In our second category, we can be confident that parts of the text were composed during exile, but cannot pin them down to either Phase II or III.

- The Temple of Concord (637–50 with n.): Ovid celebrates Tiberius' restoration of this monument on 16th January. External evidence confirms that this occurred over a year after the poet's exile (A.D. 10). But has Ovid added it during Phase II, as an 'updating' of the January festivals? Or does its potential for imperial flattery suggest that it is a later revision during Phase III?

iii) *Controversial Cases for Post-Exilic Work: either Phase II or III*

Our third and largest category consists of those ostensibly non-political parts of the text, for which we have no external dating, where a case can be put forward for its being post-exilic, in the sense that it appears to invite reflection on the poet's experience in exile. The following represent the most attractive cases in Book 1:

- The sacrifice of dogs by the Thracian tribe, the Sapaei (389–90 with n.). There is nothing to prevent this from having been written during Phase I. That said, the obscurity of the tribe, combined with the knowledge that Ovid passed through Thrace on his way to exile and actually claims to have witnessed the sacrifice personally, suggest that this detail may have been added to the text by the poet following his particular experience in exile.
- Carmentis' consolation to her son Evander (479–96 with n.). The way in which Carmentis describes Evander's plight is reminiscent of Ovid's own plight in exile.
- The dominant position of Carmentis over her wavering son Evander is analogous to Livia's dominance over the inexperienced Emperor Tiberius (515–36 (ii) n.).

These are just three examples from many: practically no part of Book 1 is now without an advocate for post-exilic working for one reason or another.[18] Though interesting, enquiry along these lines is inevitably more subjective, and the dynamics of such interpretative games have sometimes led to what appears to be straightforward contradiction.[19] Suggestions under this category, therefore, merit our extreme caution.

Conclusion

Where has our search for Ovidian Intention and the editor of *Fasti* taken us? Regrettably, not very far. Confident assigning of text to Phase III is fleeting and not entirely stable; there is a little more luck in assigning text to some point during exile (Phase II or III), but again, not a great deal; the largest category by far, and the one with which modern scholarship has been especially concerned, involves parts of the text which are not externally datable and whose interpretation is more than usually subjective. Even our basic working

---

[18] See, in general, Peeters (1939) 83–4, Fantham (1985), Feeney (1992) 15–19. For the specific case for revision of 295–310 (eulogy to astronomers), see Barchiesi (1997) 177–80; for the case for revision of 317–456 (Agonalia), see Lefèvre (1976).

[19] For example, Fantham suggests that certain parts of Book 1 have been revised so as to curry favour with Germanicus and secure the poet's return from exile [(1985) 243ff.]; but in a later piece, she suggests that a post-exilic revision serves a very different purpose, namely to express the poet's disillusionment and bitterness towards Rome [(1992b) 48].

assumptions for this section (see above and n. 13) can be called into question. How can we know for sure that Ovid was not already revising material during Phase II to reflect political changes at Rome, especially the prominent rise of Germanicus? How much weight should we attach to Ovid's comments at *Tr.* 2.549–52?[20] How much Augustan material can we confidently assign to Phase I—is it not equally plausible that there was very little Augustan praise in Phase I, and that it was added to the poem after exile? It is not that the questions we are asking are invalid; rather, the answers are generally unrewarding. Controversy will always surround this approach to the dating of the text.

c) *The Dynamics of Revision, Approach 2: The Role of the Reader*

We will never get back with any certitude to the layers of composition in the extant text of *Fasti*. There is, however, a potentially more fruitful way of looking at the issue of textual reworking, namely through the medium of the reader.[21] It is beyond reasonable doubt that some revision occurred post A.D. 14. We can therefore assert that *Fasti*, in the form we now possess it, can only have been published close to or after Ovid's death in A.D. 17.[22] If follows from this that, irrespective of the date of composition, *all* parts of the poem have the potential to admit of an exilic reading: the informed reader will be aware of Ovid's plight in exile (through popular knowledge and/ or his testimony in the exile poetry) and will inevitably look at the poem with this in mind. In effect, this approach focuses attention away from the eternally-slippery topics of Ovidian Intention[23] and reliable dating of the

[20] For scepticism, see e.g. Syme (1978) 17–18, 35–6.

[21] To my knowledge, the only scholar so far to make gestures towards this approach is Boyle [(1997) 7] who suggests that *Fasti* might *only ever* have been read "within the frame of Ovid's exile".

[22] This view is generally accepted, but there is still room for difference of opinion. Williams [(1978) 56] sees Ovid himself as the publisher of *Fasti* as some point after A.D. 14. The more popular view, however, is that the poem as we possess it was made public only after the poet's death; see Peeters (1939) 386–9 (who proposes Hyginus, Macer and Salanus as possible editors), Fränkel (1945) 148, AWC vii. Though one might speculate as to whether Ovid privately distributed earlier drafts of the poem to friends in Rome throughout his period in exile (see esp. Peeters (1939) 388–9), there is no evidence for this at all.

[23] This approach is not entirely incompatible with 'Ovidian Intention', which may be allowed to come in by the back door: writing in exile and looking forward

text and on to the ***readers*** of *Fasti*: it is the readers who will ultimately impart meaning to the text, and they can be meaningfully pinned down to a time after c. A.D. 16, i.e. after the major experiences of Ovid's exile.

An approach to textual reworking which emphasises the responses of readers would have the advantage of opening up the exilic potential of the poem. Let us take one of our examples from the 'Controversial Cases' of the last section, namely the plight of Evander in Book 1. The argument put forward by Fantham (1992a) is that Evander's exilic plight is strongly reflective of the poet's own (see Commentary, 479–96n.). If we adopt the more traditional 'Ovidian Intention' approach, we are forced to take a fairly stern view of this: certainly, some details do indeed match Ovid's depiction of his own exile, but there is a major difference in that Ovid, unlike Evander, is never categorised as 'blameless' (481); therefore, if Ovid intends a correlation, he has been careless in the detail; to save Ovid's poetic credibility, we might be forced to say that any correlation is not intended and purely coincidental. The alternative approach outlined above is not obliged to shut down the potential of the text in this way: whether or not the Evander episode was physically altered by the poet during exile—impossible to prove either way—it admits of a strong exilic reading, even if the correlation between hero and poet is not exact.

The Position of the Commentary

Ahead of the Commentary proper, I will briefly set out my own overall view surrounding the issues of dating and exilic readings in Book 1.

The 'Ovidian Intention' approach is still valuable, particularly for the political material of *Fasti* 1, and I am prepared to adopt it where I feel it works. Therefore, I take the position that Book 1 was thoroughly revised during Phase III in the sense that there is a sustained focus on Germanicus: Ovid appears to offer a consistent picture of the age after the death of Augustus, in which Tiberius is the present Emperor, Germanicus the expected successor, and Livia, with her new title Iulia Augusta, a powerful go-between. By the first three direct

---

to future publication, Ovid himself must have known that the poem was highly likely to be scrutinised in an exilic context; we might even go as far as to say that Ovid would be naïve to think that it would be read in any other way by an audience eager to consult the latest output from an imperial renegade. If this is the case, any strong exilic resonances must surely be 'intentional' in a minimal sense.

invocations to Germanicus (3, 63, 285), Ovid serves sufficient notice of his new patron, and intends us to understand Germanicus as the primary addressee for the rest of the Book. He is the addressee of 590, and I suggest that, in the subsequent ambiguous addresses, it is Tiberius and Germanicus who are the intended recipients: therefore, *nostri ducis* (613) refers to the present ruler Tiberius, *vestras* (614) to Tiberius and Germanicus, and *tuae . . . vestro* (701–2) to Germanicus and the ruling household respectively (see Commentary nn.). This consistent focus on the post-Augustan regime in Book 1 appears to be matched by a consistent thematic stress on peace. Having primarily hailed Germanicus as a man who has secured peace (63–8, 279–88), Ovid alludes to peace and peace-making more in Book 1 than in the rest of *Fasti* put together.[24]

This is, however, as far as the 'Ovidian Intention' approach allows us to go with any confidence. Yet there remain several potential yet controversial instances of later working in Book 1. In the most noteworthy cases, I provide the relevant information in the notes and suggest validity on the basis of the 'Role of the Reader' approach. I do, however, reject some cases for revision altogether under either system: for example, the supposed revision of Ovid's initial question to Janus (149–60 with n.) is based on highly questionable 'evidence' from the text and would, in any case, amount to a revision devoid of point. In short, my approach to the text aims to be pragmatic rather than dogmatic.

Finally, for ease of reference, I offer below a summary of some of the important Roman events which took place during the lifetime of the composition of *Fasti*, i.e. A.D. 2–17,[25] followed by the lines from *Fasti* 1 which (may) bear witness to these events. In all cases, readers should refer to the notes on the given lines:

---

[24] See Commentary, 3n., 657–704 (iii) n.

[25] For useful overviews of the history of this turbulent period, see Wiedemann (1975), B. Levick (1976), "The Fall of Julia the Younger", *Latomus* 35, 301–39.

Year	***Event***	***Fasti 1***
A.D. 2	Tiberius returns to Rome after eight years in voluntary exile; one of Augustus' heirs, L. Caesar, dies, causing a struggle to secure second place behind Augustus' other heir, L. Gaius; the contest is between Tiberius and Agrippa Postumus.	
A.D. 4	When L. Gaius dies, Augustus adopts both Tiberius and Agrippa Postumus as the new imperial heirs.	
A.D. 5–7/8	Rome is struck by a series of disasters, the most serious and prolonged of which is famine.	**663–704?**
A.D. 6	Temple of Castor and Pollux dedicated in the names of Tiberius and his late brother Drusus.	**705–8**
A.D. 7	Towards/at the end of the famine at Rome, Augustus sets up an altar to Ceres Mater and Ops Augusta, and starts to rebuild the temple of Liber, Libera and Ceres.	**663–704?**
A.D. 8	Ovid's exile and the banishment of Julia II	
A.D. 10	Temple of Concord dedicated by Tiberius	**637–50**
A.D. 14	Death of Augustus	
A.D. 14–17	*A post-Augustan regime*	**3–26, 536, 589–90, 613–14, 701–2**
A.D. 15	Germanicus is awarded a triumph over the German tribes on 1st January.	**63, 285–6**
A.D. 17	Germanicus celebrates his triumph on 26th May.	**285–6?**

COMMENTARY

1–2 Proem

"The festival days, as they have been arranged throughout the Latin year, the reasons behind them, and the constellations which have sunk beneath the earth and risen again—of these things will I sing."

In this short proem—reiterated in part at 2.7 and 4.11—Ovid first and foremost sets out the subject matter for *Fasti.* In line 1, he alludes to the Roman calendar, a humanly-constructed measure of time: he purports to deal with the appointed times of the Roman year, i.e. the festivals, and the various reasons behind these festivals. In line 2, Ovid moves to the constellations, the oldest measure of time, and purports to deal with their risings and settings; for the nature of stellar material in the poem, see 311–14 (ii) n. But as well as giving early indication of the themes of the poem, it has been widely recognised that these lines constitute dense and highly-conscious allusion to other works of literature (even though they may only be detectable on a re-reading of the text: see Introduction, I). By alluding to previous works of literature, Ovid can both advertise his literary affiliations to, and alert us to his divergences from, the range of traditions in which he is working; see, in general, Barchiesi (1997) 51–2, Miller (2002) 174–81, Newlands (2002) 202–3. Practically every word and phrase here is loaded:

i. causis: *Callimachus and his* Aetia

As *causae* translates the Greek αἴτια, Ovid may be directing out attention to the *Aetia* of Callimachus, a very important influence on the poem. This (fragmentary) four book elegiac poem, written in 3rd century B.C., is bound together by its special interest in investigating all manner of causes and origins of places, customs and rituals; for reconstruction of the content and design of the poem, see Cameron

(1995) 104–32. Callimachus—and this poem in particular—is immensely influential on Ovid in *Fasti*, in terms of both theme and style; see, in general, Miller (1982), Fantham (1998) 11–20; for specific influences in *Fasti* 1, see 89–288 (iii) n., 89–92n., 93n., 149–60n., 149n., 165n., 177n., 319–32n., 327n., 657–704 (ii) n.

ii. lapsaque sub terras ortaque signa: *Greek cosmogony and cosmology*

Reference to the rising and falling of constellations might be taken in a wider sense as an indication of generic affiliation to the Greek stellar tradition, especially Hesiod and Aratus, whose work was popular with and imitated by the Romans; for the Greek stellar traditions that Ovid is following, see 311–14 (ii) n.; for allusion elsewhere to Hesiod, see 101n.

iii. canam: *the pretensions of epic*

The first-person use of *cano* (see n.), and the confident, swift-flowing announcement of the poem's subject-matter, have suggested to some a grand, almost epic urgency; see e.g. D. Korzeniewski (1964), "Ovids elegisches Proömium", *Hermes* 92, 194–5; Martin (1985) 263; Miller (1991) 9. Though Ovid is deeply conscious of his poem's 'elegiac' status, he is equally keen to push the generic boundaries as far as possible, with the result that some of his narrative reaches 'epic' dimensions; for the generic self-consciousness of the poem in general, see 13–14n.; for 'epic' narrative in *Fasti* 1, see 461–586 with nn.

iv. *Ovid's* Metamorphoses: *the contemporaneous* tempora

The proem invites comparison with the other major poem on which Ovid is working contemporaneously, namely *Metamorphoses*; for the relative dating of the two, see Introduction, II n. 5. It is worth noting how closely the *Fasti* proem fits *Metamorphoses*: both deal with *tempora* (cf. *Met.* 1.4: from Chaos to the present day), offer stories to explain the *causae* of things (see esp. Myers (1994)) and deal with many *signa*; the only aspect which sets *Fasti* apart is the adoption of a calendrical structure. At this early stage, then, an important bond is made

between both poems. It may even be the case that Ovid intends *Fasti* to be read immediately after *Metamorphoses*. Certain themes in *Met.* 15 look forward to themes in *Fasti* 1, in what might be seen as an exercise in bridging the gap between the end of one poem and the beginning of another: see especially the temple of Aesculapius (291–2, cf. *Met.* 15.622–744) and (Pythagorean) discourse against the killing of animals (349–456, cf. *Met.* 15.75–142). Furthermore, given the ancient practice of referring to poems by their first word, there may be a subtle intertextual reading to Ovid's intention, at *Met.* 1.4, to bring his poem down *ad mea tempora*: might this not mean 'to the point where my *Fasti* ('*Tempora*') can take over' as well as 'to my own era'? See further Barchiesi (1991) 6–7, (1997a) 187–8; Holzberg (2002) 152.

v. *Propertius Book 4: the thwarted Roman aetiological project*

The couplet as a whole invites special comparison with a very important immediate predecessor of *Fasti*, namely the fourth book of Propertius. In the curious programmatic first poem of this book (4.1a), the poet intimates that he is leaving behind the amatory pursuits of Books 1–3 to compose poetry with a nationalistic focus. After a celebration of the mighty rise of Rome from its humble origins (1–56), the poet sets out his intention to honour Rome by 'singing about its sacred rites and days and the ancient names of places': *sacra diesque canam et cognomina prisca locorum* (69). Moreover, given the antiquarian and aetiological nature of this project, the poet looks forward to being hailed as the 'Roman Callimachus' (64), i.e. as the man who has composed a Roman equivalent to Callimachus' *Aetia*. This literary ambition, however, is abruptly cut short by a Babylonian astrologer named Horos, who, in a direct address to the poet, warns Propertius against such a grand project (71–150), telling him that he will never be able to escape the clutches of a *puella* (140) and, by inference, love poetry itself. Propertius makes no direct response to Horos, but it appears that the astrologer's predictions come true: the book as a whole suggests that Propertius has drastically compromised on his project, as it becomes a fusion of the erotic and the nationalistic; see esp. Stahl (1985) 248–305, Wyke (1987), Janan (2001) 13–17.

Propertius' initial project for Book 4, then, especially the intention to deal with sacred rites and days, is clearly recalled in Ovid's own proem in line 1. In adopting a calendrical structure for his poem, Ovid

may even be taking up the very project that Propertius had intended: both *sacra* and *dies* (Prop. 4.1.69) suggest treatment of religious festivals, possibly even the religious calendar. But, unlike Propertius 4.1, there is for Ovid no sense of tension between the elegiac poet and more serious, nationalistic subject-matter. Line 2 might even be felt to trump Propertius. As Ovid also intends to deal with the constellations, he is, in effect, playing the role of both 'Propertius' and the stargazer 'Horos'. In short, Ovid may be seen to be taking up the Callimachean challenge that was, for whatever reason, rejected by his predecessor; for Propertian intertext in *Fasti* 1, see 5–6n., 7–8n., 14n., 311–14 (iv) n.; see, in general, Miller (1991) 8–15 *et passim*, Barchiesi (1991) 1–3, 16–17.

1 tempora, taken strictly with *Latium digesta per annum*, refers to the 'appointed times' i.e. 'festivals' set out in the calendar; cf. e.g. 27, 2.7 *signataque tempora fastis*, *OLD* s.v. 1b. As the first word of the poem, however, it also anticipates other types of 'time', such as the days on which the constellations rise and set (cf. e.g. 311–14), the passing and arrival of the seasons (cf. e.g. 459–60) and the moveable festivals dependent on them (cf. e.g. 657–704 (Feriae Sementivae)).

Latium: strictly speaking, 'Latin'. The choice of adjective suggests that the poem will have a broadly Italian, rather than narrowly Roman focus. If this is the claim, then Ovid fails to deliver in the most part: there is very little discussion of rites/customs outside the urban Roman context; see Miller (1991) 148 n. 3. As such, it might be equally valid to treat *Latius* as synonymous to *Romanus*; cf. e.g. 639 *nunc bene prospicies Latiam Concordia turbam*, 3.243, 4.133, *Ars* 1.414.

digesta: for *digero* in the specific sense of setting in order the calendar, cf. 27, Sen. *Her. O.* 1094, Macr. 1.11.50 *anni . . . ordinationem a C. Caesare digestam*, *Thes.* 5.1.1118.10ff.

2 lapsaque sub terras . . . signa: *labor* is the standard verb to describe the graceful movement of the constellations; cf. e.g. 3.113, 453, Cic. *Arat.* 336–7, Lucr. 1.2 *labentia signa*, *Thes.* 7.2.781.7ff. From the perspective of the human onlooker viewing the horizon, constellations may appear to 'go beneath the earth' as they set; cf. Hes. *Op.* 617 πλειὼν δὲ κατὰ χθονὸς ἅρμενος εἶσιν (the succession of stars which make up the full year); cf. also Arat. 605–6 (Hydra rises 'above the earth'). This phenomenon is more commonly expressed in terms of the constellations 'falling into the ocean'; cf. e.g. Prop. 4.4.64 *ipsaque in Oceanum sidera lapsa cadunt*; see also 314n.

canam: a confident expression which suggests a lofty, almost epic song; cf. Hom. *h. Cer.* 1, *h. Ap.* 1, *h. Ven.* 1–2, Verg. *A.* 1.1 *arma virumque cano*; see also 1–2 (iii) n. The future tense here is part of a conscious strategy on Ovid's part to correlate the progress of the poem with the progress of the year: when the year starts properly (63ff.: January 1st), he sings in the present tense; cf. 2.7 *idem sacra cano signataque tempora fastis*, 4.12, Volk (1997) esp. 291; for simultaneity elsewhere in Book 1 between poem and year, see 71n., 150n., 495–6n., 709n., 723–4n.

3–26 Invocation to Germanicus

Ovid appeals to Germanicus, adopted son of Tiberius, to lend support to his poetic enterprise. There is a balanced structure here. Lines 3–14 [12 lines], opened with an imperative (*excipe*), address Germanicus in his role as prince and heir to imperial power. Lines 15–26 [12 lines], also opened with an imperative (*adnue*), address Germanicus as a man of civic and literary skills.

This invocation has long intrigued scholars in light of an apparent contradiction with *Tr.* 2.549–52, in which the poet claims that *Fasti* is dedicated to Augustus. It is now generally agreed that the invocation (3–26) is the clearest example of post-Augustan revision of the text: in his constant search for a return from exile, Ovid saw in Germanicus a suitable champion for his cause and rededicated the poem after the death of Augustus to reflect the changing political situation at Rome; for full discussion of the reasons for and extent of revision in *Fasti*, see Introduction, II.

Germanicus, adopted son of Tiberius, had always enjoyed the special position of being a blood relation of Augustus, his great uncle. When he married Augustus' granddaughter, Agrippina, his children became Augustus' blood descendants; his adoption into the imperial family, therefore, marked him out as the next emperor-but-one, and the true carrier of the Augustan line. Germanicus' political career only took off in A.D. 7, when he was elected quaestor, but his subsequent success in military campaigns with Tiberius earned him rapid advancement. In A.D. 12, he held the consulship, and commanded both respect and popular support from his eloquence in the law courts (see 21–2n.). It was probably at this time that Ovid first recognised

the growing power of the young prince, and decided to entertain hope of return through him; see Herbert-Brown (1994) 173–85.

This section bears many thematic and verbal similarities to *Pont.* 4.8, an epistle addressed to Suillius Rufus, datable to A.D. 15–16, in which Ovid promises to sing Germanicus' achievements in verse. We seem to be invited to read this section as a fulfilment of that promise in *Pont.* 4.8; see 5–6nn., 19–20n., 25n.; see also Introduction, II.

3–4 In her analysis of this section, Fantham observes [(1985) 254] that Ovid "oscillates between the literary fiction of a work needing the patron's inspiration to get under way and the reality of a finished work whose fate will be determined by the patron's verdict." These lines bear witness to this oscillation, as they allow for two very different meanings. The most natural translation, perhaps, sees Ovid looking for support at the start of his project: 'Cherish this work with serene face, Caesar Germanicus, and direct the journey of my nervous ship'. This translation takes *excipe* in an abstract sense and *navis* as a poetic metaphor. But the couplet might just as easily mark the finishing stage of the project: 'Take up this (finished) work with serene face, Caesar Germanicus, and direct the journey of my (real) nervous ship.' This translation takes *excipe* in a more literal sense and *navis* as the real ship that transported Ovid into exile; see 3–4nn. below.

3 excipe: the verb is perhaps more commonly used of a patron's acceptance of a completed project; cf. *Pont.* 1.1.3–4 *si vacat, hospitio peregrinos, Brute, libellos/excipe,* Mart. 9.58.5 *excipe sollicitos placide, mea dona, libellos.* It may also, however, be taken in a more abstract sense '*benigne excipere, fovere*' (*Thes.* 5.2.1251.62ff.).

pacato . . . voltu: a very rare collocation—the only other example appears at Petr. 120 (v. 94): *quare age, Fors, muta pacatum in proelia vultum*—which replaces the more common *placido . . . voltu*; cf. e.g. 2.17 *ergo ades et placido paulum mea munera voltu,* 4.161, 5.23, *Met.* 15.692. This unusual phrase foreshadows the emphasis on *pax* and its derivatives in Book 1; cf. *pactus erat* (146n.), *Pacalibus* (719n.), Fantham (1985) 246–7, 266ff.

Caesar Germanice: Ovid respectfully uses the prince's full title for the dedication; elsewhere, he alternates between *Caesar* and *Germanicus*; for *Caesar,* cf. 31 with n.; for *Germanicus,* cf. 63, 285, 4.81; see Dickey (2002) 103–4, 329.

4 timidae derige navis iter: the representation of the progress of a poem in terms of the voyage of a ship is a well-established metaphor which goes back to Pindar; for comprehensive listings, see

Fedeli on Prop. 3.3.22, Lucke on *Rem.* 811–14. Ovid uses the ship metaphor regularly in *Fasti* (cf. 466, 2.3, 863–4, 3.790, 4.18, 729–30), but he is not consistent with it. Sometimes, one particular Book of the poem appears to represent an entire ship's voyage: for example, in 466, the ship in mid-ocean correlates to a poem roughly in mid-January, and the end of Book 2 (2.863–4) is described as a ship reaching port. Elsewhere, even a new line of enquiry can represent a new nautical voyage; cf. 4.729–30 *navalibus exit/puppis; habent ventos iam mea vela suos* (Ovid's dealings with the Parilia). In the present example, the ship, like the poem, is in the early stages of its 'journey' and might well, therefore, be represented as 'nervous'; for simultaneity between poem and ship metaphor elsewhere, see Volk (2002) 21–2.

The phrase may also allude to the physical ship which brought Ovid to his place of exile (*Tr.* 1.4); Ovid may be asking his powerful patron to help navigate a real ship back to Rome.

5–6 "Do not oppose a slight honour and, come, present yourself favourably to this act of homage vowed to your godhead": Ovid suggests here two different types of relationship between himself and Germanicus. On one level, Ovid evokes a patron-client relationship. *officium* has particularly strong associations in the context of patronage, where it constitutes an act, done by one party to another, which carries with it a notion of reciprocity; cf. Cic. *Off.* 1.59; R. Saller (1982), *Personal Patronage under the Early Empire*, Cambridge, 15ff. By the emphatic placement of *officioque*, Ovid both acknowledges his status as client and also, by performing the act of honouring his patron in verse, intimates that some reward (namely a return from exile) may be owing. In fact, at *Pont.* 4.8.43 and 67, Ovid refers to his intention to sing about Germanicus in verse as an *officium*: Ovid's emphatic placement of *officioque* here might be intended to alert the reader to the fact that *Fasti* represents the fulfilment of that duty.

On another level, however, Germanicus is portrayed as a divinity, both directly (*numine*) and indirectly by the use of hymnic language (*dexter ades*: see 67n.). Germanicus, in effect, becomes both human patron and divine poetic protector, assuming the role usually occupied by Apollo or the Muses. In combining the two roles for the literary patron, Ovid follows the (more subtle) ploys of Vergil and Propertius; cf. Verg. *G.* 1.40–2 *da facilem cursum atque audacibus adnue coeptis,/ignarosque viae mecum miseratus agrestis/ingredere et votis iam nunc adsuesce vocari* (Octavian); Prop. 3.9.57–60 (Maecenas); A. Bennett (1968), "The Patron and Poetic Inspiration: Propertius 3, 9", *Hermes* 96, 337–8.

The appeal for divine poetic favour, expressed using *aversatus* and *dexter*, might invite specific comparison with Horos' warning to Propertius at the outset of his aetiological poem: Prop. 4.1.71–3 *quo ruis imprudens, vage, dicere fata, Properti?/non sunt a dextro condita fila colo./accersis lacrimas cantans, aversus Apollo.* Ovid intimates that he is learning from Propertius' mistake by seeking divine favour before embarking upon such an enterprise.

5 levem . . . honorem: Ovid elsewhere suggests with modesty that any poetic gift he might offer the young prince would be slight; cf. *Pont.* 4.8.29–36, esp. 35 *parva quidem fateor pro magnis munera reddi.* The phrase also acts as a generic key, as *levis* is one of the standard terms in discussions of elegiac poetry (see 261n.). In a more subtle way, then, Ovid enacts the standard apology to patrons for not composing loftier poetry, especially epic; for such an apology (*recusatio*), see 13–14n.

6 en (**Uς**) is preferable to *huic* (**Mω**) (possible haplography with *hoc* (4)) on the grounds that *en* is often used with an imperative as an incitement to action; cf. 3.352 *en audi crastina, quisquis ades*, Verg. *Ecl.* 6.69, *OLD* s.v. 3, Lewis/Short s.v. III; for the restoration of the text, see Wünsch (1901) 394.

devoto: *devotus* can be virtually synonymous to *deditus*; for this (rare) sense, cf. Sen. *Ben.* 5.17.1, Stat. *Silv.* 3.3.154, *Thes.* 5.1.883.29ff. It would be better, however, to retain the more literal religious sense 'vowed as an offering', especially given the divine context of the line (see 5–6n.). In *Pont.* 4.8, Ovid, comparing Germanicus to a deity, pledges to celebrate the young price in verse in exchange for a return from exile (21–36); at the end of the letter, he refers to this pledge (appropriately) as a *votum* (89). *devoto*, therefore, may allude specifically to the *votum* of *Pont.* 4.8: Ovid reminds the reader that his vow has now been met.

7–8 Ovid here gives more detail about his programme and research methods. The essential elements—*sacra* and *dies*—are emphatically placed at the beginning and end of the couplet, and help recall the (unrealised) aetiological project of Propertius: cf. Prop. 4.1.69 *sacra diesque canam et cognomina prisca locorum*; see also 1–2 (v) n., 14n.

7 sacra: the central purported theme of the poem; cf. 2.7, 6.8. *sacra*, by which Ovid means the *sacra publica*, covers all areas of state religious practice: the public celebration, prayer, peculiar ritual and sacrifice; see, in general, Dumézil (1970) 553–75, Fantham (1998) 31–5.

recognosces "you will rediscover": the point of the prefix *re-* is to suggest that the prince is *already* well versed in antiquarian mat-

ters when he comes to read the poem; for *recognosco* in this sense, cf. e.g. 4.418 *plura recognosces, pauca docendus eris*, *Met.* 11.62, Cic. *Tusc.* 1.57; for Germanicus' varied literary interests, which might give rise to such flattery from Ovid, see 25n.

annalibus eruta priscis "dug up from ancient annals": a claim to serious antiquarian research (cf. 4.11); for *eruo* in the metaphorical sense of 'unearthing' from sources, cf. Var. *L.* 6.2, Cic. *Mur.* 16 (cited below), *Fin.* 4.10, Hor. *Ep.* 2.2.115 with Brink ad loc.

annalibus might point to specific sources: the *Annales* of Ennius, the pioneering hexameter poem which charted the history of Rome; the *Annales* of Accius, which seems to have dealt with Roman religious rites and aetiology (see fr. 3 Büchner, which deals with the aetiology of the Saturnalia); the early Roman annalistic tradition—Livy (4.7.10) uses the phrase *annalibus priscis* to refer (most likely) to the *Annales Maximi*. Alternatively, Ovid may simply be attempting to establish a suitably solemn and erudite tone to his work. It is a rhetorical trick which he may have borrowed from Cicero, who uses similarly solemn diction to impress upon his audience the nobility of Servius Sulpicius; cf. Cic. *Mur.* 16 *itaque non ex sermone hominum recenti sed ex annalium vetustate eruenda memoria est nobilitatis tuae.*

However we interpret the phrase, Ovid turns out to be very reticent about his sources for the poem: the only literary sources mentioned are the various foreign calendars which he claims to have consulted (3.87–96, 6.59–63) and an inscription (3.844); the only other 'named' sources turn out to be, ironically, human and divine informants; see Wilkinson (1955) 264–8, Pasco-Pranger (2000) 279; see also 89–288 (iii) n., 103–4n., 289n.

8 et quo sit merito quaeque notata dies "and for what reason each day has gained its mark in the calendar": the official marks assigned to each date in the calendar, indicating whether it is lawful to conduct business or observe a rite, are explained at 45–60 (see nn.). For *nota/notare* in the specific sense of calendar notation, cf. 328, 3.429 *una nota est Marti Nonis*; 5.727; 6.649; *Fasti Praenestini* on Jan. 10 (Degrassi 113).

9 festa domestica vobis "festivals pertaining to your house": *festa domestica*, a unique phrase (*Thes.* 6.1.632.37), refers not to the festivals conducted privately by noble Roman families—for which, cf. Liv. 5.46.2 (Fabii), Macr. 1.16.7—but to the days, associated with the *domus Augusta*, which were added to and incorporated into the Roman year by both Julius Caesar and Augustus in their reformation

of the calendar; see Herbert-Brown (1994) 15–26; for the concept of the *domus Augusta*, see 532n.

Ovid is true to his word here, as commemoration of the Julian family forms a major part of the poem. In Book 1, four entries are associated with the Julian family: 587–616 (Octavian's assumption of the title 'Augustus'), 637–50 (Tiberius' dedication of a Temple to Concord), 705–8 (Tiberius' and Drusus' dedication of a Temple to Castor and Pollux), 709–24 (dedication of the Ara Pacis Augustae); see also 63–4n., 285–6n., 515–36n., 657–704 (iii) n. For praise of the Julian family elsewhere in *Fasti*, cf. 2.55–66, 119–44, 635–8, 3.415–28, 697–710, 4.347–8, 377–86, 949–54, 5.545–98, 6.455–60, 637–48.

10 saepe tibi pater est, saepe legendus avus: the anaphora of *saepe* and the balance between first and second half of the line create a sense of harmony and continuity between different generations of the Julian family; for Ovid's predilection for anaphora of *saepe*, cf. e.g. 5.299–301, *Met.* 1.481–2, 2.812–13, 8.465–6, *Am.* 1.11.5–6, 2.19.20; for parallel half-lines, see Wills (1996) 414–18.

In reality, however, Ovid focuses much more on Augustus than Tiberius. Tiberius is only alluded to three times in the poem—all in Book 1—and never named directly; cf. 533 (*natus* (see n.)), 646 *dux venerande*, 706 (one of the dedicators of the Temple of Castor and Pollux); for the possible tensions between Ovid and Tiberius, see Introduction, II.

In appropriate panegyric style, Ovid buys into the idea of the Augustan *domus* by talking in terms of Germanicus' *pater, avus* and *frater* (12). In doing so, he glosses over the nervous bout of imperial adoptions which occur during the early years A.D.: Germanicus is the son of Tiberius through adoption (strictly speaking, he is Tiberius' nephew); he is the grandson of Augustus through a 'double' adoption; he is brother of Drusus by adoption (strictly speaking, they are cousins).

11–12 Ovid suggests that any honours that Augustus and Tiberius bring will be transferred on to the younger members of the household, namely his addressee Germanicus and his brother Drusus. This form of flattery is, in part, encouraged by the fact that, at this early stage in his career, Germanicus has not yet earned sufficient honours to guarantee his own place in the calendar; honour will need to be bestowed upon him through the deeds of his family. Nevertheless, Ovid does manage to incorporate Germanicus appropriately into the calendar on 1st January, by virtue of the military victory awarded him on that day (see 63–4n., 285–6n.); other references to him are, how-

ever, tacked on to days with which he has no specific connection; cf. 615–16, 4.81–2, Herbert-Brown (1994) 178–9.

11 pictos signantia fastos "marking the painted calendars": the calendars to which Ovid refers are those which were put on display in public places around Rome. Far from being detailed or prescriptive documents, the function of these calendars seems to have been to act as memory-aids for the literate Romans as to the religious status of the particular day; for the status of these calendars, see esp. Scheid (1992) 119–21, Feeney (1998) 123–5; for the remains of the *fasti*, see Degrassi (1963). By his use of *pictos*, Ovid alludes to the red covering and/or red lettering which typically adorned official documents; cf. Mart. 11.4.5, 12.29.5 (consular *fasti*), Pers. 5.88–90, Petr. 46, Juv. 14.192–3 (titles of laws written in red ink).

12 cum Druso . . . fratre: see 10n.

praemia: the sense is closest to 'glory'; cf. Hor. *Ep.* 2.1.78, Prop. 4.4.94 *o vigil, iniustae praemia sortis habes*, *Thes.* 10.2.716.5ff.

13–14 Caesaris arma canant alii: nos Caesaris aras/et quoscumque sacris addidit ille dies "Let others sing about Caesar's arms: I will sing about Caesar's altars, and whatever days he added to the sacred rites": Ovid appears to set up in opposition two themes for poetry, *arma* and *arae*, with a pledge to concentrate on the latter. This is a very important, if very elusive programmatic statement, and interpretation has divided scholars.

As a starting point, it is clear that the statement is modelled on earlier 'apologies' from elegiac poets for writing on a topic other than *arma*—a by-word for epic and its 'weighty' subject-matter (see 13n.)—typically on the grounds that the elegiac metre and/or elegiac poet can only deliver 'lighter' themes; cf. *Am.* 1.1.1–4; 2.1.11–38; Prop. 2.1.17–46 (esp. 25, where *bellaque resque . . . Caesaris* is highlighted as a weighty theme); 2.10, 2.34.59–64 (esp. 63, where *arma* is highlighted as a weighty theme).

But Ovid's *recusatio* here is no commonplace; for the first time, it is not love which is hailed as the poet's subject matter, but *Caesaris arae*, by which we should understand all types of 'sacred area' set up or revitalised by the Julian family; for this etymological sense, cf. Var. *L.* 5.38 *loca pura areae; a quo potest etiam ara deum*, Isid. 15.13.6, Maltby 45 s.v. Ovid, it might seem, has found a new path through the generic jungle. His subject matter appears to be sufficiently 'peaceful' to be generically compatible with elegy. It is, nevertheless, a serious, almost 'weighty' subject-matter which can be directed towards Rome

and the imperial family. The whole statement, then, can be interpreted as an endorsement of Augustan discourse, which champions a religious revival under the Principate and typically downplays warfare; for the rhetoric of religious revival under Augustus, see esp. Zanker (1988) 101ff., BNP I.168–9; for the downplaying of warfare, especially in iconography, see Zanker (1988) 110–14.

However, it has been recognized that the dichotomy that Ovid sets up between *arma* and *arae* is deeply problematic, precisely because religious buildings, and religious days in general, are often based on *military* exploits. Ovid is, moreover, fully aware of this reality, as he often details the military exploits which lie behind the foundation of monuments; cf. e.g., in Book 1, 263–74 (repulsion of the armed Sabines), 543–82 (Hercules and Cacus), 637–50 (reasons for Temple of Concord).

What, then, are we to make of this apparent dichotomy? Fantham [(1985) 258, (1998) 25] denies any thematic disjuncture in the poem; she interprets 13–14 as merely a literary device designed to reaffirm Ovid's status as the poet of (albeit 'new' kind of) elegy.

Others, perhaps rightly, observe the dichotomy, and are left to interpret the rest of the poem in light of it. Some see the issue as a question of emphasis: though, contrary to the clear-cut dichotomy of 13–14, Ovid will be obliged to deal with *arma*, he will do his best to honour his generic affiliations—though, at the same time, extend generic boundaries for elegy—by 'reducing' or 'downplaying' their role; see esp. Hinds (1992) 81–152, Barchiesi (1997) 19–23, Miller (2002) 181–2; for Ovid's 'reducing' of *arma* in Book 1, see 261n.

Newlands [(1995) 18, 124–45], however, takes the stronger line that the dichotomy is specifically designed to collapse, especially in the last two books, where the emphasis on *arma* becomes more prominent; this has a generic significance in that it announces the "inherent resistance of [Ovid's] subject to elegiac ideals" (18) and anticipates the abandonment of the project after only six books. It is worth noting that the dichotomy may collapse as early as Book 1, especially during the section on the Ara Pacis (709–22), where the dealings with *aram* (709) lead speedily to a call for the maintenance of *arma* (715); the anagrammatic nature of these terms, moreover, suggests a worrying closeness in association.

No one interpretation, it would seem, can pin down Ovid's thematic and generic programme in *Fasti*, and it would be prudent to keep all viable interpretations in mind.

13 arma canant: the phrase has obvious associations with epic in light of the first line of Vergil's *Aeneid: arma virumque cano*. Given the ancient tendency to refer to a famous work by its first word, *arma* becomes a by-word for epic; for *Aeneid* as the recognised 'benchmark' for Roman epic, cf. e.g. *Am.* 1.1.1 with McKeown ad loc., Prop. 2.34.61–4.

14 et quoscumque sacris addidit ille dies: for the days added to the calendar by both Julius Caesar and Augustus, see 9n. The close proximity of *sacris* and *dies* serves to reaffirm Ovid's intention to follow the thematic agenda that was ultimately abandoned by Propertius in his fourth book; cf. Prop. 4.1.69 *sacra diesque canam et cognomina prisca locorum*; see also 1–2 (v) n., 7–8n.

15–16 The language of Ovid's appeal suggests a divine status for his patron Germanicus. *adnue* is commonly used in prayer to appeal for divine favour; cf. e.g. *Am.* 3.2.56 *inceptis adnue, diva, meis* (Venus), Verg. *G.* 1.40 (as here, addressed to a 'deified' literary patron), Tib. 2.5.121, Appel (1909) 138. Furthermore, *excute corde metus* suggests that Germanicus is a higher being. The appeal to 'shake out trembling fear from my heart' is most appropriately made to a higher being, who has the power to bring such relief to mortals; cf. e.g. 101 *disce metu posito* (Janus), 6.20 (Juno), *Her.* 16.68 (Venus and Juno), *Met.* 3.689–90 *excute . . . /corde metum Diamque tene* (Bacchus to Acoetes); for an expression of fear as an appropriate and natural reaction when a mortal is in the presence of a higher, supernatural being; see 97–8n.; for other divine overtones to Germanicus, see 5–6n.

15 conanti per laudes ire tuorum "as I attempt to course through the commendations of your family": cf. 2.16 *per titulos ingredimurque tuos* (Ovid to Augustus). The idiom *per eo*, first found here in Ovid, flatteringly suggests a vastness of material which must be trawled through and, consequently, a real effort for the compiler (hence the tentative *conanti*); cf. *Tr.* 5.9.31–2 *sic mea lege data vincta atque inclusa Thalia/per titulum vetiti nominis ire cupit*, Stat. *Ach.* 1.4 (the desire to detail all the deeds of Achilles), Sen. *Nat.* 2.59.2, *Thes.* 5.2.649.19ff. The use of *laudes . . . tuorum* is a reminder that the commendations are not those of Germanicus himself, but of the more senior members of his imperial family, through which he can himself draw distinction; see 11–12n.

16 pavidos . . . metus: a pleonastic phrase ('trembling fear') which is essentially confined to Ovid; cf. *Am.* 1.7.20, *Ars* 2.88, *Thes.* 8.907.53, 908.51.

excute . . . metus: for the idiom, cf. *Her.* 14.43, Liv. 2.65.4, Sen. *Her. O.* 712, *Thes.* 5.2.1310.76–7; see also 15–16n.

17 da mihi te placidum, dederis in carmina vires "Only show yourself peaceable to me, and you will have given strength to my song": it is typically the task of the literary patron to give heart to a poetic enterprise; cf. Man. 1.7–10 *hunc mihi tu, Caesar . . . das animum viresque facis ad tanta canenda* (Tiberius), Luc. 1.66 *tu satis ad vires Romana in carmina dandas* (Nero). Once again, Ovid employs religious language to raise Germanicus to the level of a god: *da* is a popular imperative for opening a prayer (Appel (1909) 133–4) and *placidum* is often used in appeals for divine mildness (see 3n.); for Germanicus' divine status, see also 5–6n., 15–16n.

da . . . dederis: the imperative is commonly used in the protasis of a conditional clause; cf. e.g. *Am.* 2.2.40, 3.9.37 *vive pius—moriere pius*, Cic. *Tusc.* 2.28, H.-Sz. 656–7, K.-St. II.165; for parataxis in Ovid in general, see Bömer ad loc. Even so, the use of the future perfect in the apodosis of such paratactic clauses is very rare; cf. Cic. *Tusc.* 1.30 *tolle hanc opinionem, luctum sustuleris.* The future perfect may be employed to convey the speed of the result once the condition has been fulfilled. However, given that this section (3–26) can be read both as an appeal for inspiration at the beginning of the enterprise and as an appeal for acceptance of the finished project (see 3–4n.), the temporal complexities in *da . . . dederis* may be intentional: is Ovid perhaps asking Germanicus to show favour to the *finished* project, in which case he would have given (in retrospect) strength to the project *at its outset*?

18 ingenium: Ovid regularly draws attention to his own *ingenium*, which is the 'raw talent' which makes poetry possible; cf. e.g. *Am.* 1.9.32, *Tr.* 2.424, Newman (1967) 395ff.; for the distinction between *ingenium* and *ars*, see 23–4n.

voltu: "*vultus* properly describes the face as a vehicle of character or emotion rather than a physical entity with a specific conformation (= *facies*)" (Brown on Lucr. 4.1224).

19–20 pagina iudicium docti subitura movetur/principis "My page, about to be submitted to the judgment of a learned prince, is moved": two different interpretations are possible here, depending on how *pagina* is translated. *pagina* can be taken metonymically to denote a (written) poem/piece of writing; cf. *Pont.* 3.1.57, Verg. *Ecl.* 6.12, Mart. 1.4.8, *Thes.* 10.1.88.31ff., Herescu (1958) 155–6. The phraseology would thus suggest a poem in its finishing stages,

soon to be put under a patron's scrutiny. Alternatively, *pagina* can be taken in its literal sense and denote the first page of the poem; Ovid is therefore envisaging his patron's scrutiny of the poem as it is being written; for the 'temporal oscillation' of this section, see 3–4n. Ovid's page is 'moved', but the reason is unspecified. It may be awe of the prince's erudition and divine status (see 15–16n.), or fear of the implications of an unfavourable hearing.

docti . . . principis: Germanicus is likewise referred to as 'learned prince' at *Pont.* 4.8.77. *doctus* hints at Germanicus' literary talents (see 25n.). *princeps* is a title commonly attached to members of the imperial family, especially Augustus; cf. e.g. 2.142, Prop. 4.6.46, Nisbet/Hubbard on Hor. *Carm.* 1.2.50.

20 ut Clario missa legenda deo: the 'Clarian god' is Apollo, who had a famous cult at Claros; *Clarius* subsequently becomes a popular epithet for the god; cf. *Ars* 2.80, *Met.* 11.413, Call. *Ap.* 70, Verg. *A.* 3.360. The correlation between Germanicus and Apollo (god of poetry) constitutes the most explicit connection between patron and divine source of inspiration; for other correlations, see 5–6n.

Germanicus himself did in fact make a special visit to the ancient oracle of Claros, near Colophon, in A.D. 18—cf. Tac. *Ann.* 2.54 with Goodyear ad loc.—but, as it is generally held that Ovid died in A.D. 17 (see Introduction, II), specific allusion is unlikely.

21–2 Ovid draws attention both to his patron's skill in forensic oratory and to his kindness in helping those in dire need, both of which were recognised qualities of the prince; cf. *Pont.* 2.5.41–46, Suet. *Cal.* 3.1 *ingenium in utroque eloquentiae doctrinaeque genere praecellens, benivolentiam singularem*, Tac. *Ann.* 2.83.3 with Goodyear ad loc. The phraseology of the flattery recalls Horace's praise of Pollio; cf. *Carm.* 2.1.13 *insigne maestis praesidium reis*. The phraseology, moreover, aligns the plight of the defendants with that of the poet himself: both are 'frightened defendants' (cf. 16) who require the help of Germanicus to dispel the charge levelled against them.

21 facundia is especially used of forensic eloquence; cf. *Met.* 13.137, *Tr.* 4.4.5, Sall. *Iug.* 30, *Thes.* 6.1.158.12ff.

sensimus: the switch to the first-person plural (cf. 23 *scimus*) might be rendered literally, 'we (the Romans)', or as an alternative to the first-person singular.

22 civica . . . arma: *civicus* in a strictly legal sense is unique; consequently, *civica arma* is an unparalleled means of expressing legal aid. The use of *arma* is interesting in light of the programmatic statement

of 13–14. In one sense, Ovid makes *arma* generically compatible to elegy by only evoking 'arms' taken up for peaceful purposes; by the same token, however, Ovid has (unnecessarily) brought *arma* into his poem. Either way, the dichotomy of 13–14 is blurred; see 13–14n.

trepidis . . . reis: a popular collocation in Ovid; cf. *Ars* 1.460, *Pont.* 1.2.116, 2.2.50.

23–4 This marks a transition from Germanicus' talents in oratory (21–2) to those in poetry (25). By the prominent positioning of *artes* and *ingenii*, Ovid evokes the standard terms of ancient literary criticism, whereby *ingenium* is the 'raw talent' required for poetry (see 18n.) and *ars* the actual skill in poetic composition; for these distinct and typically polarised qualities, cf. *Am.* 1.15.14 *quamvis ingenio non valet, arte valet* (Ennius); Prop. 2.24.23 *contendat mecum ingenio, contendat et arte*; Quint. *Inst.* 1.8.8; Brink on Hor. *Ars* 408–18; Luck on Ov. *Tr.* 2.423f. There is no suggestion here that the prince is lacking in either quality; for Germanicus' literary output, see 25n.

23 scimus: for the change in person, see 21n.

nostras . . . artes: either 'my arts' or 'our (shared) arts'.

impetus is here the personal drive to write poetry; cf. 6.6, *Pont.* 3.4.21, 4.2.25 *impetus ille sacer, qui vatum pectora nutrit*, Sen. *Nat.* 3.27.13, *Thes.* 7.1.610.33ff.

24 ingenii . . . flumina: the transferred use of *flumen* to refer to the 'flowing abundance' of a particular talent is first found in Cicero with regard to oratory; cf. Cic. *Brut.* 325, *Orat.* 2.62, *Thes.* 6.1.967.4ff. Ovid is perhaps the first to apply the metaphor to poetic talent; cf. possibly Cic. *Marc.* 4 *nullius tantum est flumen ingenii* (oratory or poetry?). The metaphor is particularly suited to poetic talent given that the Hippocrene font on Mount Helicon is traditionally viewed as the source of poetic inspiration; for the story, cf. esp. *Met.* 5.256ff. with Hinds (1987) 3–24.

25 si licet et fas est: while *licet* is quite general, *fas* refers specifically to 'divine law', and the phrase *si fas est* is a common opening in prayer to ensure that there is no religious impediment to what follows; cf. *Her.* 16.63 (to look upon Mercury), *Tr.* 5.2.46 (to converse with Jupiter), Tib. 2.3.74 (to Venus), *Thes.* 6.1.288.51ff.; for Ovid's usage of the phrase with 'divinised' members of the imperial family, cf. *Tr.* 3.1.81 (Augustus), *Pont.* 2.8.37 (Tiberius).

fas is also etymologically related to *fari* 'speak' (see 48n.) and might be translated 'speakable'. The issue of the correct time to speak is a leitmotif of *Fasti* (especially Book 1) which may reflect the increas-

ing intolerance of free speech in the latter years of the Augustan Principate; see 445n.

Given the standard formulaic nature of this opening, *si licet* (ς) is preferable to the better-attested *scilicet* (**AUMς**), which may have arisen through haplography with *scimus* (23) and would create awkward repetition with *scilicet* (29).

vates rege vatis habenas "guide the reins of a poet, yourself a poet": the polyptoton of *vates* (101n.) provides an effective way of appealing to professional solidarity; for similar appeals, cf. *Pont.* 2.5.57–60 (Salanus), 2.9.65 *ad vatem vates orantia brachia tendo* (King Cotys), esp. 4.8.67 *non potes officium vatis contemnere vates* (Germanicus); for Ovid's effective use of polyptoton in general, see Wills (1996) 213–16. Germanicus' literary output apparently included comedies in Greek (Suet. *Cal.* 3.2, *Claud.* 11.3), a poem for a horse's funeral mound (Plin. *Nat.* 8.155) and, possibly, a translation of Aratus' *Phaenomena* (for which, see 311–14 (iv) n.); Ovid elsewhere flatters the prince with the suggestion that he would have produced more had he not been destined for greater things (*Pont.* 4.8.69–70).

habenas may continue the ship metaphor for poetry evoked at 4 (n.), as the noun is sometimes used to refer to the ropes/rudder that control the journey of a ship; cf. 3.593, Var. *Men.* 224, Verg. *A.* 6.1 *classique immittit habenas*, *Thes.* 6.3.2392.79ff. It is, however, more natural to take *habenas* to refer to the reins of a horse; Ovid is thus signalling a new but well-established metaphor for the poem, namely that of the chariot-race; for the metaphor in *Fasti*, cf. 2.360 *inque suo noster pulvere currat equus*, 4.10, 6.585–6; for previous usages, cf. *Rem.* 397–8 with Lucke ad loc., Lucr. 6.47, Prop. 3.9.57–8, 4.1.70. Poets are quite happy to use both metaphors simultaneously; cf. e.g. *Ars* 1.39–40 (chariot), 771–2 (ship), Verg. *G.* 2.39–46 (ship), 541–2 (chariot). For the potential 'collapse' of the metaphor in the poem—from poet as competent charioteer to poet unable to restrain his horses—see Newlands (1995) 204–7.

26 auspice te felix totus ut annus eat: the phraseology of this divine appeal closely resembles Tibullus' call to Apollo at Tib. 2.5.81–2: *et succensa sacris crepitet bene laurea flammis,/ omine quo felix et satur annus erit.* For the phrase *felix annus*, cf. also *Pont.* 4.4.18, *Ciris* 27.

The appeal can be taken on two levels. On a poetic level, Ovid is appealing to his 'divine' patron for good favour for the entire year, i.e. for his poem which will deal with the entire year. On another level, Ovid may be alluding to the special control over the auspices of the

year that Germanicus had in his position as augur in A.D. 7/8; cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.62, 83; G. Sumner (1967), "Germanicus and Drusus Caesar", *Latomus* 26, 432. To this end, *auspice te* (**Uς**) 'with you as augur' might provide a more pointed allusion than *auspicio* (**Mς**).

27–62 Before dealing with the individual dates and festivals of the year, Ovid offers essential general information to an understanding of the history and workings of the Roman calendar. First, he gives a brief history of the formation of the Roman year: Romulus first establishes a year of ten months (27–42), after which two months are added by Numa (43–4). Ovid then focuses on the calendar proper by introducing the different rules that govern different days in the month, informing a Roman whether business is lawful, or a certain festival/sacrifice is to be observed (45–60).

Ovid's Fasti *and the Didactic Tradition*

More than any other part of *Fasti*, perhaps, this section adopts a style most readily associated with the didactic tradition.

First, this section is very logically structured, as if designed to offer the reader clear guidance on the set-up of the year (27–38), followed by the months (39–44) and finally the individual days (45–60). Ovid seems to be particularly influenced by Varro (*L.* 6.12–34), who covers the same topics (with many of the same etymologies (see nn.)) but, interestingly, in the reverse order; cf. 63ff. = Var. *L.* 6.12–26 (the yearly cycle of festivals); 45–60 = Var. *L.* 6.27–32 (the meanings behind the labels attached to the days); 27–44 = Var. *L.* 6.33–4 (the formation of the year and the naming of months). Secondly, Ovid evokes a teacher-student relationship here—an essential part of the didactic strategy (see Toohey (1996) 2, Volk (2002) 37–9)—in which he acts as instructor and shows concern for his (unspecified) addressee by delivering him from error; cf. 45 *ne tamen ignores variorum iura dierum*, 49 *nec toto perstare die sua iura putaris*, 58 *ne fallare cave* (with nn.).

All this raises the slippery issue of *Fasti*'s relationship to the didactic tradition. Toohey [(1996) 2–5, 127–8], whilst acknowledging the differences between Ovid's poem and most other didactic poems (especially in terms of metre), sees *Fasti* as fulfilling the important didactic criteria (as he sees them) and is, as such, "written primarily within the didactic tradition" (127). Newlands [(1995) 52–7] takes a more cau-

tious approach: the poem is essentially didactic, but the would-be teacher increasingly finds himself in the reverse role of diffident student in a world of uncertainty of knowledge. Others dismiss the label 'didactic' altogether, and see instead Ovid's didactic persona as simply one of a number of guises adopted and dropped at will during the poem; see Miller (1992b) 11–12, Volk (2002) 34–43 esp. 42–3.

My own view lies somewhere in-between the last two, in that I believe that Ovid plays with the reader's expectations early in Book 1. The opening section (1–62)—and 27–62 in particular—gives the impression that *Fasti* will be a didactic poem, with Ovid casting himself in the role of instructor, and the reader as student. But this turns out to be disingenuous: rather than a sign of things to come, Ovid's didactic stance here merely provides a temporary and effective means of getting the more pedestrian aspects of the calendar out of the way at the beginning, thus allowing him to deal with the festivals in the manner he chooses. The first entry proper (63–288, 1st January), in effect, obliterates the didactic façade: Ovid swaps places with the traditional didactic addressee and becomes the student himself; ironically, it is his addressee, Janus, who becomes the instructor and 'didactic poet' (see 89–288 (iv) n.). From this point onwards, Ovid only adopts fleetingly the 'didactic mode'; see Miller (1980), (1982) 400ff., (1992b).

In terms of poetic affiliation, Ovid essentially identifies the poem with 'lighter' elegy in opposition to epic; see 13–14n.

27–44 Ovid charts the preliminary work on the Roman year undertaken by the first two kings of Rome, Romulus and Numa. Lines 27–38 deal with Romulus' institution of a ten-month calendar and the reasons behind this; 39–42 outline the order of the months; 43–4 concern Numa's modifications to his predecessor's system. Ovid will go into more detail about the development of the Roman calendar, culminating with Julius Caesar and Augustus, at 3.99–166.

Ovid is the first extant author to state specifically that Romulus instituted a ten-month calendar which was later emended by Numa; for later accounts, cf. Plu. *Numa* 18, *Mor.* 268a–d, Gel. 3.16.16, Macr. 1.12.3. It is, however, most likely that this tradition was established long before Ovid: Varro (*L.* 6.33–4) mentions that two months were originally added to a ten-month calendar, but gives no names; Livy (1.19.6–7) says that Numa divided the year into twelve months, a statement which does not rule out the possibility that he was, in fact, reforming an existing system (Ogilvie ad loc.); Censorinus (20.2, 20.4,

22.9) suggests that the tradition goes back to M. Iunius Gracchanus and Fulvius Nobilior (cos. 189 B.C.); for the lack of ancient consensus as to the origins of the Roman year, cf. Cens. 20.2.

In concentrating in this section on the differing yet complementary characters of the first two kings, Ovid follows in a tradition of identifying Romulus and Numa as the most important and most diametrically-opposed of the Roman kings. As in this section, Romulus is typically depicted as warlike and unlearned, in contrast to the peace-loving and sophisticated Numa; cf. *Met.* 14.799, 15.1–8, 479–84 (Romulus and Numa are the only two Roman kings to be named in Ovid's 'history'), Liv. 1.21.6 *alius alia via, ille bello hic pace civitatem auxerunt*, Verg. *A.* 6.777–87, 808–12, Dumézil (1970) 198–9.

The two kings are very important to *Fasti*, as they articulate both the thematic and generic tensions of the poem. Romulus' predilection for warfare makes him representative of the theme (*arma*) and genre (epic) that Ovid is consciously purporting to reject in this poem (see 13–14n.). Numa, by contrast, is treated in a more sympathetic way in *Fasti*, by virtue of his peaceful and learned nature (particularly his religious piety): he is, both thematically and generically, consistent with the priorities of the poem and the poet himself; for the importance of these two characters in *Fasti*, see Hinds (1992) 113–24; Barchiesi (1997) 111, 175–6; Gee (2000) 41–7; Littlewood (2002); Pasco-Pranger (2002b).

27 tempora digereret . . . anno: the phraseology clearly recalls the first line of the poem (*tempora . . . digesta . . . annum*), signalling the end of the invocation to Germanicus (3–26) and the start of the thematic agenda proper.

conditor Urbis: the phrase is typically used by Ovid to refer to Romulus; cf. 3.24, *Am.* 2.14.15–16, *Met.* 14.849 with Bömer ad loc.

28 quinque bis: for the high poetic level of such numeral duplication, see 564n. The phraseology may allude to one of the apparent reasons why Romulus opted for ten months, namely because it matched the number of fingers on both hands; cf. 3.123 *seu quia tot digiti, per quos numerare solemus.*

29–32 With the intimate use of vocatives (29, 31), Ovid sets up a forum of discussion in which he acts as mediator between Romulus and Caesar.

29 scilicet arma magis quam sidera, Romule, noras: Ovid typecasts Romulus in his traditional role as an essentially military

man with little interest in academic pursuits such as stargazing; for Romulus' ignorance of the stars, cf. 3.99ff., esp. 111–12 *inobservata per annum/sidera*. It will be Julius Caesar and Augustus who ultimately give due regard to the importance of the stars in the measurement of time; cf. 3.155–66; see also 43–4n. In the process, Ovid subtly sets up a dichotomy between *arma* and *sidera* in which he himself is interested: in contrast to Romulus, Ovid claims to deal with stars instead of the epic theme of *arma*; see further Hinds (1992) 115–16, 120ff., Gee (2000) 21–65.

The tone of *scilicet* can vary from sarcastic/ironic to simple matter-of-fact (see e.g. Mynors on Verg. *G.* 1.282). Ovid may be indulging in a spot of light-hearted banter here at Romulus' expense, but he may equally be commenting seriously on the primary need of early Rome to develop herself militarily; for the early Roman battles with neighbouring tribes (30), especially the Sabines, cf. e.g. 3.179ff., Liv. 1.9ff.

31–2 "There is, however, reason indeed, Caesar, which might have moved him: he has made a personal mistake for which he might be pardoned".

31 est tamen et: the collocation forcefully sets up the defence for Romulus' institution of the ten-month calendar.

Caesar allows for different addressees. It could refer to Ovid's immediate addressee, his patron Germanicus. It could equally refer to Julius Caesar or Augustus, both of whom were recently involved in reforming the calendar (9n.) and might, therefore, be particularly intrigued as to Romulus' initial decision to adopt a ten-month calendar.

32 erroremque suum quo tueatur habet: the phraseology is suggestive in light of the poet's exile. *error* (innocent mistake as opposed to premeditated malice) is the key, elusive term used by Ovid in his exile poetry to explain the reason for his banishment; cf. e.g. *Tr.* 1.3.37–8, 2.207 *perdiderint cum me duo crimina, carmen et error*, 3.1.52, 6.25–6, 11.34. In suggesting that Romulus made an error in spite of some rationale (31), the reader may be tempted to view Ovid's error more sympathetically.

33–4 "The amount of time which is sufficient for a child to move forth from the womb of its mother, this amount of time, he decided, was sufficient for the year": the Romans regularly reckoned that the human gestation period lasted nine or ten months; for a ten-month pregnancy, cf. e.g. 2.175–6 *luna novum decies implerat cornibus orbem:/quae fuerat virgo credita, mater erat* (Callisto), 2.447–8, 3.43–5, 5.534, Pl. *Am.*

481, Verg. *Ecl.* 4.61, *Thes.* 5.1.171.52ff.; for the apparent difference of opinion surrounding the actual number of months, cf. Cic. *Nat.* 2.69 with Pease ad loc., Gel. 3.16.

Ovid is, however, the first to suggest that Romulus may have based his ten-month calendar on this natural measurement of time; cf. 3.121–6 *annus erat decimum cum luna receperat orbem ... seu quia bis quinto femina mense parit* (one of a number of possible reasons given). As such, Ovid attributes the first king with a certain amount of logic in his formation of the year, in contrast to other sources, which deny any degree of rationality behind the Romulean year; cf. Plu. *Numa* 18, Macr. 1.12.2–3.

33 utero matris dum prodeat infans: the use of *prodeo* to describe human birth is very rare; cf. Sen. *Ep.* 54.4 *si quid in hac re tormenti est, necesse est et fuisse, antequam prodiremus in lucem*, Arnob. *Adv. Nat.* 7.32, *Thes.* 10.2.1598.17ff. The phrase has an elevated feel which, in turn, lends additional weight to Romulus' decision to use this natural process as the basis for his year.

35–6 It was customary for a widow to mourn her husband for ten months before remarrying; cf. 3.134, Plu. *Numa* 12.2, *Cor.* 39.5, *Ant.* 31.3, also Sen. *Ep.* 63.13 *annum feminis ad lugendum constituere maiores* (i.e. the ancient year of ten months). As is intimated by *tristia signa* (36), the widow was required to wear black (or dark) clothing during the mourning period; cf. e.g. Dion. Hal. 8.62.2, Lygd. 2.18 with Navarro-Antolín ad loc., Juv. 10.245, Serv. *A.* 3.64. Furthermore, apart from visits to her mother-in-law, she was expected to stay inside her house during this period (*in vidua ... domo* (36)); cf. Cic. *Clu.* 35.

The opening *per totidem* (35) does not make clear whether Ovid is attributing the institution of this custom to Romulus, or simply making an observation on the sanctity of the ten-month period. By mentioning the custom here, though, Ovid at least leaves open the possibility that the Romulean year gave rise to this custom (or vice versa); cf. esp. Plu. *Numa* 12.2, where the custom is attributed to Numa, who just happened to set ten months as the upper limit for mourning. By demonstrating its affinity with the cycles of both life (33–4) and death, Ovid manages to make Romulus' institution of a ten-month year look like a very well-reasoned (if astronomically-naïve) move.

37 haec igitur vidit trabeati cura Quirini "These things, then, in his devotion did cloaked Quirinus see": the personified use of *cura* here defies literal translation. It does, however, help recall 30 (*cura ... maior*) and bring out the full implication of *maior*: though

arma are his primary concern, they are not his sole concern, and he shows both an ability and willingness to conduct matters of the state in a careful, deliberate manner. Note also the change of mood from subjunctive (*moverit, tueatur* (31–2)) to indicative (*vidit*): Ovid moves imperceptibly from speculation to apparent fact, thus reinforcing his own sympathetic treatment of Romulus.

Quirinus is the name commonly identified with the deified Romulus; cf. 2.475 with Bömer ad loc., *Met.* 15.572, 756, Hor. *Carm.* 1.2.46 with Nisbet/Hubbard ad loc. It has a proleptic sense here. The *trabea* was a short cloak of Etruscan origin, of which there were apparently three types (Suet. ap. Serv. *A.* 7.612). It was a white and purple *trabea* which was originally worn by the Roman kings and later, in Republican times, by the equites; see, in general, Bömer on 6.375, Ogilvie on Liv. 1.41.6. This cloak is particularly associated with the deified Romulus; cf. 2.503–4 *pulcher et humano maior trabeaque decorus/ Romulus in media visus adesse via*, 6.375, 796, Verg. *A.* 7.187–8, Plin. *Nat.* 9.136; for the specific phrase *trabeatus Quirinus*, cf. *Met.* 14.828.

38 cum . . . annua iura daret: the idiom *iura do* usually means 'to legislate, dispense justice'; see 207n., 252n. But the phrase here is unlikely to mean 'while he was dispensing justice for the year'; for this meaning, cf. 2.851–2 *capit annua consul/ iura.* Rather, *annua iura* refers to the formation of the calendar, i.e. 'while he was giving the laws which regulate the year'.

rudibus populis: *rudibus* alludes to the 'rough' agricultural lifestyle of the inhabitants of early Rome; see 193–206 (with nn.). *populis* is either poetic plural (cf. e.g. 207) or an allusion to the various cultural backgrounds that made up the early Roman state (cf. 2.510).

39–42 Ovid turns to the naming and ordering of months in Romulus' year and the reasons behind this. The order of thought here reflects the logic of Romulus' reasoning: he first appropriately honours the two deities who oversee the well-being of Rome (39–40); he then honours the two mortal factions that manage Rome's affairs on a daily basis (41).

39 Martis erat primus mensis: almost all sources agree that March took its name from Mars; cf. e.g. Var. *L.* 6.33, Plu. *Numa* 18.3, Macr. 1.12.5, Serv. *G.* 1.43, Maltby 369–70 s.v.

Venerisque secundus: the more popular derivation of April is from *aperio*, because April was considered to be the spring month which *opens* plant life. Ovid, however, defends the lesser view that April took its name from Venus, via her Greek counterpart Aphrodite;

for Ovid's defence of his derivation, cf. 4.61–132; for ancient scepticism surrounding a connection with Venus, cf. Var. *L.* 6.33, Plu. *Numa* 19.2, Macr. 1.12.8, Serv. *G.* 1.43, Maltby 44 s.v. Ovid's insistence on a connection with Venus stems from both his desire to characterise Romulus as a man of reason in his formation of the year (see 40n.) and his close (poetic) association with the goddess (cf. 4.1–18).

40 The king named the first two months after Mars and Venus as a mark of respect to his father and the author of his race through Aeneas respectively; cf. 3.73–6, 4.25–8, Cens. 22.9, Macr. 1.12.8; see also 39–42n.

41 tertius a senibus, iuvenum de nomine quartus: Ovid adopts the popular view that May was named after the elder members of the Roman community (*maiores*) and June the younger members (*iuvenes/iuveniores*); for this tradition, cf. Var. *L.* 6.33, Plu. *Numa* 19.3, *Mor.* 285a–b, Cens. 22.9–12, Macr. 1.12.16, Serv. *G.* 1.43, Maltby 318 s.v., 360 s.v.

It is later suggested (5.55–78, 6.83–8) that Romulus named the months in this way as a mark of respect to the two sections of society, old and young, who managed matters of council and war respectively. This emerges, however, as only one set of possible reasons for the naming of May and June entertained by a committee of Muses (5.1–110) and goddesses (6.1–100). With the poet arbiter ultimately unable to choose between the derivations (5.108–10, 6.97–100), we are presented, in retrospect, with a potential crisis of authority; see Barchiesi (1991), Newlands (1995) 73–85.

42 quae sequitur, numero turba notata fuit: the names for the remaining six months were derived from their numerical position in the year, i.e. Quin(c)tilis, Sextilis, September, October, November, December; cf. 3.149–50 *denique quintus ab hoc fuerat Quintilis, et inde/incipit a numero nomina quisquis habet*, Var. *L.* 6.34, Plu. *Numa* 19.1, Cens. 22.9, Macr. 1.12.5, Serv. *G.* 1.43. Ovid does not mention that, by his day, the months Quin(c)tilis and Sextilis had been changed to Iulius and Augustus, in honour of Julius Caesar and Augustus (cf. e.g. Plu. *Numa* 19.4). One might excuse the omission on the grounds that Ovid is here talking about the calendar at the time of Romulus. The omission is also, however, part of a conscious strategy in the poem of denying/postponing a celebration of these important imperial months; cf. 5.145–8 (tantalising postponement of worship to Augustus until his month), Hinds (1987) 137 n. 23, Feeney (1992) 15–19.

turba typically denotes a disorderly mass (see *OLD* s.v. 1, 2, Lewis/Short s.v. II.B). This is a rare example of the noun used to refer to

an orderly set; cf. Mart. 12.34.5–7 *et si calculus omnis huc et illuc/diversus bicolorque digeratur,/vincet candida turba nigriorem*, *OLD* s.v. 5a.

43–4 To the Romulean calendar, Numa prefixed two months. The first was Ianuarius, in honour of the god Janus (63ff.). The second was Februarius: *avitas . . . umbras* ('shades of ancestors' (43)) alludes to the popular derivation of the month from *februa*, which were instruments of purification to the dead; for the etymology, cf. 2.19–34, Var. *L.* 6.34, Fest. 85 L., Plu. *Mor.* 280b–c, Cens. 22.14, Maltby 227 s.v.

It should be noted that Numa's reasons for adding to the calendar stem here from religious grounds—a desire to honour the supernatural forces in charge of beginnings and endings—rather than from mathematical/astronomical observations, as suggested by other sources; cf. Liv. 1.19.6–7, Plu. *Numa* 18.1–2, Serv. *G.* 1.43. In *Fasti*, Numa is seen only as part of the process of calendar reformation; it is ultimately Julius Caesar and Augustus who take astronomy into account to reform the calendar successfully; cf. 3.155–66.

45–62 From a history of the formation of the Roman year, Ovid moves to the significance behind the individual days in his own age.

45 ne tamen ignores: the delivering of information to the addressee(s), in the hope that they may avoid error or ignorance, is a primary duty of the didactic teacher; for similar direct appeals to addressees, cf. 58 with n., 2.47–8 *sed tamen, antiqui ne nescius ordinis erres,/primus, ut est, Iani mensis et ante fuit*, 3.435, 6.25 (Juno as instructor), Man. 2.714–15, 3.385–9; for the didactic 'façade' of *Fasti*, see 27–62n.

iura: i.e. the human laws that govern the individual days.

46 officii (Aς) . . . **idem**: partitive genitive with *idem* is quite rare but used elsewhere by Ovid; cf. 2.334 *soporis idem*, 5.108, Var. *R.* 1.20.5, Liv. 25.22.4, H.-Sz. 47, 52.

Lucifer, often used poetically to refer to the dawn, is commonly used in Ovid in an extended sense to refer to the entire day; cf. 2.567–8 *nec tamen haec ultra, quam tot de mense supersint/Luciferi, quot habent carmina nostra pedes*, 3.772, 6.211, Prop. 2.19.28, *Thes.* 7.2.1711.13ff.

47–8 The simple structure and heavy anaphora of the couplet—*nefastus erit, per quem . . . fastus erit, per quem*—suggest a clear-cut distinction between days on which business is permitted or forbidden. This makes the sudden 'retuning' of the information in 49–52—a typical Ovidian didactic strategy—all the more striking; see 49–52n.

47 ille nefastus erit, per quem tria verba silentur "that day will be *nefastus* on which the three words are not mentioned": *dies*

nefasti—marked by an 'N' in the calendars (Fest. 163 L.)—were days on which legal business was not permitted; see, in general, Michels (1967) 61–8. The 'three words' to which Ovid refers are '*do, dico, addico*', which were used by the praetor in his administering of legal proceedings; cf. Var. *L.* 6.30 *contrarii horum vocantur dies nefasti, per quos dies nefas fari praetorem 'do', 'dico', 'addico'; itaque non potest agi: necesse est aliquo eorum uti verbo, cum lege quid peragitur,* Macr. 1.16.14. In a less direct manner than Varro and Macrobius, Ovid's phraseology alludes to a derivation of *nefastus* from an inability to speak (*non fari*, 'not to speak'); for the etymology of *fastus*, see 48n.

48 fastus erit, per quem lege licebit agi "that day will be *fastus* on which it is permitted to take legal proceedings": *dies fasti*—marked by an 'F' in the calendars—were days on which legal business was permitted; see, in general, Michels (1967) 48–54. For the idiom *lege agere* 'to take legal proceedings', cf. Ter. *Ph.* 984, Cic. *Caec.* 97, Liv. 9.46.5, *Fasti Praenestini* on Jan. 2 (Degrassi 111).

The specific meaning of the adjective *fastus* is unclear, as it is only ever used to describe this group of days in the calendar; see *Thes.* 6.1.325.68ff. The ancient sources popularly connect it to the verb *fari* ('to speak'); cf. 51 *licet omnia fari* (i.e. the day is *fastus*), Var. *L.* 6.29 *dies fasti, per quos praetoribus omnia verba sine piaculo licet fari,* 6.53, *Fasti Praenestini* on Jan. 2 (Degrassi 111), Macr. 1.16.14, Suet. ap. Priscian 8.20, Maltby 224 s.v.; see also 47n. But the vagueness of this etymology has prompted modern scholars to explore alternatives; for discussion, see Ernout/Meillet s.v. *fas*, Michels (1967) 52–4, Porte (1985) 303–7.

49–52 Ovid describes a particular type of day in which it was unlawful (*nefastus*) to conduct legal business until a sacrifice had taken place (51); from that point on—50 implies the afternoon—legal business was permitted (*fastus*). The special day in question was marked in the calendars as Q.R.C.F. and generally taken to stand for '*Quando rex comitiavit fas*' (though see Ovid below), of which there were only two in the entire year, 24th March and 24th May; cf. Var. *L.* 6.31 *dies qui vocatur sic 'Quando rex comitiavit fas', is dictus ab eo quod eo die rex sacrificio ius dicat ad Comitium, ad quod tempus est nefas, ab eo fas: itaque post id tempus lege actum saepe; Fasti Praenestini* on Mar. 24 (Degrassi 123); Fest. 311 L. The *rex* in question was probably the *rex sacrorum*, who was in charge of official sacrifice (see 333n.), but the exact meaning of *comitiavit* is unclear; for speculation concerning the exact meaning and configuration of Q.R.C.F, cf. 5.727–8 *quattuor inde notis locus est, quibus ordine lectis/vel mos sacrorum vel fuga regis* [i.e. '*quando rex comitio fugerit*']

inest (24th May); Michels (1967) 107 n. 47; Brind'Amour (1983) 232–4.

So why does Ovid draw attention to this type of day and not, for example, to the more common *dies endotercisi* (eight in the year)? The answer, I think, lies in Ovid's poetic and didactic strategy. Ovid chooses this day because it provides the most effective means of drawing attention to the unpredictability of the calendar. All the apparently straightforward lessons of 47–8 are abruptly 'retuned' here, a sense reinforced by (negative) verbal echoes: the sense of day-long rules, emphasised by the repetition of *per quem* in 47–8, is here undone by the use of *nec . . . perstare* (49); *qui iam fastus erit, mane nefastus erat* (50) complicates the clear-cut rulings of *ille nefastus erit . . . fastus erit* (47–8). This 'retuning' of instruction is a classic Ovidian didactic strategy, in that it emphasises the difficulty of the subject being taught and increases the student's dependency on the teacher, who must listen to the entire lesson to get the full understanding; for use of this technique elsewhere, cf. e.g. *Ars* 1.269ff., 351ff. (Ovid first informs the student that all women can be caught, but then 'retunes' this by saying that handmaidens must be approached beforehand), 2.425ff.; for the didactic façade of *Fasti*, see 27–62n.

49 nec . . . putaris: a formula particularly popular in didactic literature, where it reveals the teacher's concern to deliver his student from error; cf. *Ars* 1.733–4 *nec turpe putaris/palliolum nitidis inposuisse comis*, *Rem.* 243, 465, Man. 2.244; see also 27–62n.

toto perstare die: the text is problematic here: *perstare* (**Uω**), *praestare* (**AMς**); *die* (**AUMω**), *dies* (**A**). The present reading should, however, stand, as Ovid elsewhere uses ablative of duration after *perstare*; cf. 3.137–8 *laurea flaminibus quae toto perstitit anno/tollitur*. Moreover, *perstare* is preferable to *praestare* on stylistic grounds (see 49–52n.).

51 exta: as Ovid implies here, it was the *exta* (the entrails, consisting of the liver, gall bladder and lungs) which were offered up to the gods at a sacrifice, while the *viscera* (the flesh of the animal, defined as the part between skin and bone) were consumed by the human attendants and guests; cf. 389 *exta canum vidi Triviae libare Sapaeos*, 450, 2.712, 4.638, 670–1, 908, 936, 6.346, *Met.* 7.600 with Bömer ad loc., Lygd. 4.6 with Navarro Antolín ad loc., Dumézil (1970) 558–9. But Ovid is not always consistent with this terminology; see 588n., 672n.

fari: for the popular etymology of *fastus* from *fari* 'to speak', see 48n.

52 honoratus . . . praetor: for *honoratus* used specifically of those who hold public office, cf. *Pont.* 4.5.1–2 *ite, leves elegi, doctas ad consulis*

aures/verbaque honorato ferte legenda viro, Cic. *Brut.* 281, *Tusc.* 1.85, *OLD* s.v. 2, *Thes.* 6.3.2948.82ff. For the (three) important words which the praetor was allowed to utter on *dies fasti*, see 47n.

53 est quoque, quo populum ius est includere saeptis "There is also (a day) on which it is the law to enclose the people within the voting booths": Ovid refers here to the *dies comitiales*, the largest group of days in the Roman year, marked by a 'C' in the calendars. On these days, if no other festivals had been announced for celebration, magistrates could summon the citizens to vote in their assemblies (*comitia*) on a variety of measures; cf. Var. *L.* 6.29; *Fasti Praenestini* on Jan. 3 (Degrassi 111); Fest. 34 L.; Macr. 1.16.14; Michels (1967) 36–47.

saeptis (perhaps *Saeptis*) is a clear reference to the *Saepta Iulia*, the massive voting enclosures on the Campus Martius begun by Julius Caesar (Cic. *Att.* 4.16.4) and finally completed under Agrippa in 26 B.C. The *Saepta* replaced a more primitive structure for voting, known as the *ovile*; for the *Saepta*, see Platner/Ashby 460–1, Steinby IV.228–9; for voting practice at the *Saepta*, see L. Taylor (1966), *Roman Voting Assemblies from the Hannibalic War to the Dictatorship of Caesar*, Michigan, 47–58.

As the terms *saepta* and *ovile* suggest, the voting enclosures were so named because they resembled sheepfolds; cf. Serv. *Ecl.* 1.33. The phraseology here may be intended to evoke this original meaning: by making *ius* the subject, and giving the people a passive role (*populum*, accusative), Ovid playfully suggests that the populace are, like sheep, locked in against their will.

54 est quoque, qui nono semper ab orbe redit "there is also a day which always returns again after a cycle of nine days": Ovid refers here to the *nundinae*, which occurred every eight days (nine days in the Roman system of inclusive counting, from where its name is derived). *Nundinae* were market-days, originally instituted for the benefit of members of the rural community so that they could come to town, sell their wares and sort out any other city business; cf. Var. *R.* 2 *praef.* 1–2, Verg. *Mor.* 79–81, Col. 1 *praef.* 18, Macr. 1.16.30–5. Ovid perhaps also alludes here to the 'nundinal letters', which marked each date in the official calendars consecutively A–H as a visual reminder of the next market-day; see Michels (1967) 27–8, 84–9, 191–206.

For *orbis* used to denote the cycle of a particular period of time (here, a day), cf. e.g. Verg. *A.* 6.745, Prop. 3.18.16 *tot bona tam parvo clausit in orbe dies*, Sen. *Ep.* 12.6, *Thes.* 9.2.912.36ff.

55–7 Ovid draws attention to the Kalends (1st day of the month), Nones (5th or 7th) and Ides (13th or 15th) which provided the three marker-points in any given month. All other dates were expressed in terms of how many days (inclusive counting) they occurred before the next marker; see, in general, Michels (1967) 19–22.

55 vindicat Ausonias Iunonis cura Kalendas: the Kalends fell on the first day of the month, and this was the day on which the minor pontifex announced whether the Nones of that month would fall on 5th or 7th; cf. Var. *L.* 6.27, Macr. 1.15.12, Michels (1967) 19–20. The name was popularly thought to have derived from *calo* ('I call'), either because the Nones *were called* on this day or because the people *were called* together by the officials; cf. Var. *L.* 6.27 *primi dies mensium nominati kalendae, quod his diebus calantur eius mensis nonae a pontificibus*, Plu. *Mor.* 269b–c, Macr. 1.15.11, Serv. *A.* 8.654, Maltby 321 s.v.

On the Kalends, it was customary for the *regina* (wife of the *rex sacrorum* (see 333n.)) to sacrifice a sow or lamb to Juno, who was, along with Janus, a protecting deity for the day; cf. Macr. 1.15.18, Dumézil (1970) 294–5. By the phraseology of 56—*Iovi grandior agna* (sc. *quam Iunoni*)—Ovid allusively suggests an ovine victim for Juno.

Auson, son of Odysseus and Circe/Calypso, was the mythical progenitor of the Ausonians, who were reputed to have inhabited middle and lower Italy. *Ausonius* subsequently becomes a popular poetic synonym for *Italius* (Fest. 16 L. s.v. 'Ausoniam', Serv. *A.* 3.171); cf. e.g. 542, 619, 4.266, 5.588, 658, 6.504, *Thes.* 2.1537.78ff.

56 Idibus alba Iovi grandior agna cadit: the Ides, occurring on either 13th or 15th of each month, were originally supposed to coincide with a full moon. Derivations of *Idus* range from the beauty (εἶδος) of the visible moon (Plu. *Mor.* 269d, Macr. 1.15.16), to a verb *iduare* meaning 'divide', as the Ides 'divide' the month (Macr. 1.15.17), to the Etruscan/Sabine names, *Itus/Idus* (Var. *L.* 6.28); see Maltby 292 s.v.

The day was sacred to Jupiter, to whom sacrifice was conducted by his priest, the Flamen Dialis (see 587n.), in the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitol; cf. 587–8, 4.621–2 *occupat Apriles Idus cognomine Victor/Iuppiter*, 6.650, Fest. 93 L., Macr. 1.15.14ff., Dumézil (1970) 180–1.

The victim mentioned here is a ewe-lamb, rather than the more standard offering of a (male) sheep, known as *idulis ovis*; cf. 588 with n., Fest. 93 L., Macr. 1.15.16. The choice here is best explained in terms of Ovid's desire for concise phraseology: *grandior agna* is a neat (and perfectly respectful) way of comparing the ovine victims offered

to both Juno and Jupiter (see also 55n.). For the practice of offering white victims to the heavenly gods, see 720n.

57 Nonarum tutela deo caret: the *Nonae* (feminine plural of *nonus* 'ninth') were widely believed to be so named because they always fell nine days (inclusive counting) before the Ides of that month, i.e. on either 5th or 7th; cf. Var. *L.* 6.28, Fest. 176 L., Macr. 1.15.13; for alternative etymologies, see Michels (1967) 130–2, Maltby 414 s.v. The only source to credit the Nones with a guardian deity (Jupiter) is the fifth century A.D. commentator, Johannes Lydus (*Mens.* 3.11).

57–60 The final set of days that Ovid mentions are the so-called *dies atri* ('black days'), on which it was considered unlucky, and hence forbidden, to conduct any religious matter; cf. Var. *L.* 6.29, Plu. *Mor.* 269e, Fest. 348 L., Macr. 1.15.13, Michels (1967) 65–6, Brind'Amour (1983) 230–1. There were thirty-six such days in the calendar, and they occurred on the day that followed each Kalends, Nones and Ides, i.e. 2nd, 6th/8th, 14th/16th of the month. Though these days were given no special marking in the official calendars, their status as 'black' overrode any other ruling: twenty-five of these days were, in fact, labelled *Fastus* (F).

The institution of the *dies atri*, alluded to in 59–60, was popularly traced back to the heavy defeat the Romans suffered against the Gauls at the battle of the Allia on 18th July, 390 B.C. The sacrifice that preceded this battle had taken place on the day after the Ides of July (i.e. 16th); the Romans subsequently lost the battle badly; the Senate ultimately decided that the day that followed every one of the three marker-days should be deemed unlucky and free from religious observance; cf. Liv. 6.1.11–12, Gel. 5.17.1–2 (citing Verrius Flaccus), Macr. 1.16.21–5 (citing Gnaeus Gellius and Cassius Hemina).

True to this ruling, there is no record of triumphs held or temples dedicated on *dies atri*; the only official event that might take place was a continuation of games from previous days; cf. 4.377–86 (games on 6th April celebrating Julius Caesar's victory at Thapsus in 46 B.C.), Michels (1967) 66. Though Ovid does deal with several 'black days' in *Fasti*, they are predominantly reserved for astronomical comment; cf. e.g. 2.73ff., 243ff., 3.459ff., 711–12, 4.165ff., 5.159ff., 417–18, 6.197–8.

57 omnibus istis: i.e. the Kalends, Nones and Ides.

58 ne fallare cave: an interjection which reinforces the speaker's persona as teacher and guide to his student addressees; for similarly-styled didactic interjections, cf. 2.151 *ne fallare tamen, restant tibi fri-*

gora, restant, Ars 3.443, Man. 2.738, 4.366; for the didactic façade of *Fasti*, see 27–62n.

ater: such days may well have been considered 'black' for their connotations of death and ill-fortune; cf. 60 *damna . . . tristia*, Macr. 1.16.21 *dies autem postriduanos ad omnia maiores nostri cavendos putarunt, quos etiam atros velut infausta appellatione damnarunt.* There may be, however, a quite different derivation of *dies atri* from *dies atrus* 'the day after' (cf. Quinquatrus = 'five days after (the Ides)' (Var. *L.* 6.14)); see Michels (1967) 65 n. 16, Brind'Amour (1983) 230–1, Porte (1985) 241–3.

59 illis . . . diebus: Ovid's phraseology suggests that the battle date was itself a 'black day', which is incorrect: the battle of the Allia took place on 18th July; the *dies ater* was the day after the Ides, 16th July, on which the ill-fated sacrifice took place. Ovid is, therefore, either marking the defeat of the Romans from the time of the ill-omened sacrifice, or confusing battle date with *dies ater* (Porte (1985) 373–5).

60 damna here denotes military losses; cf. 6.767, *Rem.* 220 *damnis Allia nota suis*, Liv. 2.64.6, *OLD* s.v. 2c, *Thes.* 5.1.26.23ff.

sub averso . . . Marte "in an adverse campaign" or "under the frown of Mars" (Frazer): an epic expression; cf. Verg. *A.* 12.1–2 *Turnus ut infractos adverso Marte Latinos/defecisse videt*, Luc. 1.308–9 *Marte sub adverso ruerentque in terga feroces/Gallorum populi?*, Stat. *Theb.* 11.287.

61 haec mihi dicta semel: the absence of further general comment on the nature of days elsewhere in the poem suggests that *haec* refers back to the entire set of rulings (45–60) rather than just the previous comment on *atri dies* (as argued by Wheeler (1999) 45–6).

haerentia: for *haereo* in the more abstract sense 'connected with', cf. Var. *R.* 1.17.1 *de fundi quattuor partibus, quae cum solo haerent, et alteris quattuor, quae extra fundum sunt et ad culturam pertinent, dixi*, Hor. *Ars* 195, *OLD* s.v. 5b, *Thes.* 6.3.2495.68ff.

fastis: both the official calendars and his own poem, *Fasti.*

62 seriem rerum: the phrase is used of any chain of events; cf. Verg. *A.* 1.641 (list of exploits of Dido's ancestors), Luc. 3.75 (list of military achievements), 5.179, Stat. *Silv.* 1.2.187 *sic rerum series mundique revertitur aetas.* Phrases constructed with *rerum* have a distinctly elevated feel and immediately recall Lucretius (170 occurences); cf. 107 with n., *Met.* 15.68 *rerum causas* (Pythagoras' discourse), Lucr. 1.21 *rerum naturam*, 25, 3.1072, Verg. *G.* 2.490 *rerum causas* (philosophers), Luc. 1.67 *causas rerum* (epic subject-matter of the Civil Wars). Given the solemnity of the phrase, I take it here to refer to the orderly

procession of festivals in the calendar, rather than to Ovid's own continuous poetic narrative (as suggested by Barchiesi (1997) 104).

Taken in the way I suggest, the entire sentiment intimates that *Fasti*'s subject-matter will be serious and solemn, and that the calendar-structure insists on a strict ordering of material which should not be broken by the sort of general discussion that has preceded. Both of these intimations will prove misleading, as the poem exhibits a variety of tones and reveals a poet who is not confined to the order of the official calendars; see Introduction, I.

scindere here takes an abstract sense 'break the continuity of a process, i.e. interrupt'; cf. *Pont.* 3.1.157 *nec tua si fletu scindentur verba, nocebit*, Plin. *Nat.* 22.111, Plin. *Pan.* 37, Stat. *Theb.* 11.197.

63–294 1st January

63–4 tibi faustum, Germanice, nuntiat annum . . . Ianus: Janus announces a lucky year for the young prince. It has been suggested that Ovid is alluding to a specific year here, to a decree of the Senate awarding Germanicus a triumph against the Germans, passed on 1st January, A.D. 15, whilst the war was still in progress (Tac. *Ann.* 1.55ff.); see Herbert-Brown (1994) 168. This is possible, as Ovid may allude to the same event at the end of the section on Janus (see 285–6n.). The vagueness of the pleasantry might, however, suggest that this is merely a general wish for a lucky year for his patron; for the uttering of such pleasantries on the first day of the year, cf. Cic. *Div.* 1.102 with Pease ad loc., Sen. *Ep.* 87.3, Plin. *Nat.* 28.22 *cur enim primum anni incipientis diem laetis precationibus invicem faustum ominamur?*, Tac. *Ann.* 4.70, *CIL* 2.4969.2, 15.6205 *annum novum faustum felicem Ioviano*, *Thes.* 6.1.389.28ff.

64 Ianus: for the nature of the god, see 89–288 (ii) n.

65–74 With a succession of imperatives and jussive subjunctives—*ades* (67, 69), *resera* (70), *favete* (71), *vacent* (73), *absint* (73), *differ* (74)—Ovid briefly adopts the guise of Master of Ceremony, leading the prayer to Janus (65–70) and giving instructions to the people (71–4). This is a favourite narrative ploy of Ovid's to describe religious festivals; see 657–704 (ii) n.

65–70 In invoking Janus, Ovid adopts a standard format for prayer, categorised as the 'Du-Stil' by Norden, whereby the focus on the deity is maintained by the repetition of parts of *tu/tuus* (*tua* [66], *tuis*

[69], *tuo* [70]); cf. *Met.* 4.17ff., Pind. *Nem.* 7, Call. *Jov.* 45ff., Lucr. 1.1ff., Cat. 61.51ff., Verg. *A.* 8.293ff., Tib. 1.7.23–8, Norden (1956) 149ff.

65–6 Ovid starts with a progressive tricolon: an invocation of the god followed by acknowledgements of his special duty and attribute (the latter expressed within a relative clause [66]). This style of opening is typical of ancient prayers; cf. e.g. Hom. *Il.* 1.37ff., Lucr. 1.1–4 *Aeneadum genetrix, hominum divomque voluptas, / alma Venus, caeli subter labentia signa/ quae mare navigerum,* Hor. *Carm.* 1.10.1–4, 1.12.13–16, Norden (1956) 168ff. Ovid's reference to Janus' double face (66)—his most distinctive feature—reveals a curiosity on the part of the poet, and will provide the substance for his first question to the god (91–2); see also 66n.

65 biceps: a standard epithet for the god; cf. 230, *Pont.* 4.4.23, Sept. *poet.* fr. 23.1 *Iane pater, . . . dive biceps,* Macr. 1.13.3.

anni tacite labentis origo "the source of the silently-passing year": *origo* is a powerful word here which promotes an image of Janus as the source from which the year originates. This grand and novel way of expressing Janus' jurisdiction over the entire year—for which, cf. Mart. 8.2.1 *fastorum genitor parensque Ianus,* Macr. 1.9.10, 16—fits the solemnity of the prayer. *labor* is regularly used to express the idea of time passing by unnoticed (lit. 'gliding'), sometimes reinforced by *tacitus*; cf. 6.771, *Tr.* 4.6.17, 4.10.27 *interea tacito passu labentibus annis,* Verg. *G.* 1.6, Hor. *Carm.* 2.14.2, Sen. *Dial.* 10.8.5 *aetas . . . tacita labetur, Thes.* 7.2.788.8ff.

66 tua terga: *terga* is often a poetic plural, but as Janus has two heads, and hence two backs, the plural here is 'precise'. Ovid plays on the duality of Janus' appearance throughout this section, often creating contrasts between 'actual' and poetic plurals; see 96n., 100n., 102n., 255–6n.

67–70 By the anaphora of *dexter ades,* Ovid prays in equal measure for divine favour for both those who promote Rome's interests abroad and maintain peace (the leaders, 67–8) and those who ensure prosperity for Rome at home (the senators and people, 69). Accumulation of similar words/anaphora is characteristic of sacerdotal language; cf. e.g. 667–8, 695, Tib. 2.1.5, 17, Appel (1909) 142ff. Moreover, given Ovid's regular play on Janus' dual form (66n.), the anaphora may hint at the possibility that he is addressing each face of the god in turn.

67 dexter ades: the formal language of Roman prayer. *ades* is the standard formula for invoking a deity (see 712n.) and the appeal for divine favour is regularly made using *dexter*; cf. 6, 69, Verg. *A.*

8.302, Prop. 4.9.72, Sil. 1.514 *dexter ades Phrygiae delenti stirpis alumnos* (to the deified Hercules), *anth.* 2.250.12 *fautor tu dexter adesto*, *Thes.* 5.1.924.19ff.

ducibus: if Ovid has any individuals in mind here, it is likely to be both Tiberius and Germanicus; for the post-Augustan outlook of Book 1, see Introduction, II.

67–8 secura . . . otia: *otium*, here used in the sense of 'peace' (i.e. absence of war), was a dynamic political slogan of the late Republic and early Empire, and hence became a popular theme in panegyric; cf. 4.925–6 *utilius gladios et tela nocentia carpes:/nil opus est illis otia mundus agit*, Hor. *Carm.* 4.15.17–18, Galinsky (1996) 243–4. The virtually-pleonastic phrase here ('carefree peace') is not uncommon—cf. *Tr.* 3.2.9, Verg. *G.* 3.376–7 *ipsi . . . secura sub alta/otia agunt terra*, V. Max. 5.3.4—and is particularly appropriate in the panegyric context. Moreover, the anaphora of *otia* in 68 creates a balance in the line which might be felt to reflect the peaceful harmony that the leaders have given to the world.

labore: the 'toil' here is in the military sense; for the general Roman recognition that the maintenance of peace requires a constant military presence, see 709–22 (ii) n.

69 patribusque tuis populoque Quirini: reference to the Roman people as *populus Quirini* makes use of the well-established identification of Quirinus with the deified Romulus; see 37n. The phrase here includes the senators as well, and appears to be an (unparalleled) poetic means of expressing the official formula *Senatui Populoque Romano.*

70 As Janus is both god of the present month and the doorkeeper par excellence, it is doubly appropriate that he should be asked to open the temples on 1st January.

nutu . . . tuo: for the nod as the classic indication of divine approval for a particular action (here, the opening of temples), cf. e.g. 2.489–50, Hom. *Il.* 1.528ff., Cat. 64.204, Verg. *A.* 9.106, 10.115 with Harrison ad loc.

candida templa: *candidus* is the standard adjective to describe the whiteness of the marble from which Roman temples were constructed; cf. *Tr.* 3.1.60 *ducor ad intonsi candida templa dei*, Verg. *A.* 8.720, Claud. *Carm.* 22.227, André (1949) 32–3; see also 637n. This is no idle adjective: Augustus' programme of building public monuments out of marble, rather than brick, must have given a new visual brilliance to the city; cf. Suet. *Aug.* 28.2 (Augustus' boast to have found Rome in brick and left it in marble), Favro (1996) 183–9, 218–20.

71 prospera lux oritur: a correlation is made here between the

chronological progression of the poem and the passing of the year; see 2n.

linguis animisque favete "be favourable in both word and thought": the call for 'favour in tongues' (*linguis favete*) is a standard ritual proclamation which bids either the uttering of good-omened words or else (more commonly) complete silence; cf. e.g. 2.654 *linguis candida turba favet* (Terminalia), *Am.* 3.2.43, 3.13.29, *Tr.* 5.5.5, Cic. *Div.* 1.102 with Pease ad loc., Hor. *Carm.* 3.1.2, Serv. *A.* 5.71 *favete linguis, favete vocibus hoc est, aut bona omina habete aut tacete.* The extended formula with *animisque* also appears to have been used regularly; cf. *Am.* 3.2.43, *Met.* 15.677, Juv. 4.12, Mart. 10.87.3, Appel (1909) 189.

72 dicenda . . . bona verba: the call for 'good words, i.e. words of good omen' was typically made on holy days; cf. *Tr.* 3.13.24, *Pont.* 3.4.47, Hor. *Carm.* 3.14.10–12, Appel (1909) 188. This call is not dissimilar to *linguis favete* (71), and the two proclamations are elsewhere found together; cf. Tib. 2.2.1–2 *dicamus bona verba, venit Natalis ad aras:/ quisquis ades, lingua, vir mulierque, fave.*

73–4 lite vacent aures, insanaque protinus absint/iurgia: engagement in lawsuits (*lites*) and other legal wranglings (*iurgia*) was typically forbidden on holy days; cf. Cic. *Div.* 1.102 with Pease ad loc., *Leg.* 2.19, 2.29 *tum feriarum festorumque dierum ratio in liberis requietem litium habet et iurgiorum,* Liv. 5.13.7, 38.51.8. However, on this particular holy day, in order to acquire good omen for the year, some 'mock' business was carried out (see 167–70n. with n.).

References to the 'madness' of legal court life may well have been conventional; cf. e.g. Prop. 4.1.133–4. Such negative impressions of court life are, however, particularly prominent in Ovid—note the eagerness with which he wishes legal business away (*protinus*)—and reveal a consistent picture of a man who disliked the legal profession in which he was briefly engaged earlier in his career; cf. *Am.* 1.15.1–6 *Quid mihi, Livor edax . . ./ ingeniique vocas carmen inertis opus . . . nec me verbosas leges ediscere nec me/ ingrato vocem prostituisse foro* with McKeown ad loc., *Tr.* 3.12.17–18, 4.10.17ff., Kenney (1969) 243–9, White (2002) 3–4.

74 livida lingua: though the MSS are divided between *turba* (**AMω**) and *lingua* (**Uς**), *lingua* is preferable on logical grounds: the first sentiment of the couplet reveals, in abstract terms, the suffering party (*aures* (73)); in similarly abstract fashion, the final sentiment reveals the perpetrator.

75–88 Ovid proceeds to describe the inaugural ceremony for the newly-elected consuls—the *processus consularis*—which involved a formal

procession up to the Capitol and sacrifice to Jupiter in the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus; for general discussions, see Meslin (1970) 23–7, Scullard (1981) 52–3, Graf (1998) 199–203. This ceremony had taken place each year on 1st January since 153 B.C. (Liv. *Per.* 47), before which time the consuls appear to have entered office on variable dates (3.147–8, Frazer on 79). Ovid describes the event in some detail. We are first introduced to the colour, smell and sound of the occasion (75–8). We then follow the ceremony in order: the procession up to the Capitol (79–82), the animal sacrifice (83–4) and the perceived reaction of Jupiter (85–6). The poet ends the scene with rejoicing (87–8).

The detailing of the ceremony on the scale we find here is largely confined to (later) panegyric literature addressed to a particular consul: typically, the individual is congratulated on his assumption of consular status, and emphasis on the majesty of his particular inaugural ceremony is often a key part of the eulogy. Such is the case elsewhere in Ovid, where praise of a new consul (and a plea for assistance to secure the poet's return from exile) involves a detailed description of his inaugural ceremony; cf. *Pont.* 4.4.23ff. (Sextus Pompeius), 4.9.23ff. (P. Pomponius Graecinus); for further examples, cf. Stat. *Silv.* 4.1 (Domitian), Sid. *Carm.* 2.1–8, 544–6 (Anthemius), Claud. *Carm.* 1.226–32 (Probinus and Olybrius), 7.1–6, 8.1–17 (Honorius), 17.270ff. (Manlius), Du Quesnay (1977) 43–7. However, there appears to be no such desire to praise a specific consul in this section. On the contrary, the passage is noteworthy for the way in which all the human participants in the ceremony are marginalised: the only direct reference to humans in the entire section is *populus* (79–80n.). More appropriately within a poem which promises to deal with Roman festivals, Ovid focuses on the majesty and splendour of the occasion itself and the ways in which it appeals to the senses: emphasis is put on its various colours (*aurum* (77), *vestibus intactis* (79), *purpura* (81), *ebur* (82)), its brightness (*luceat* (75), *nitore* (77), *iubar* (78), *fulget* (81), *conspicuum* (82)) its smell (*odoratis* (75)) and sound (*sonet* (76) and 75–6n.). In the same way, Ovid's closing prayer (87–8), in which he praises the day and wishes for ever better ones, suggests a timeless admiration for the event itself rather than an interest in the inauguration ceremony of a specific individual (see 87–8n.).

The entire occasion here is viewed by the poet in an outwardly positive light. However, it would be instructive to consider this section within the wider context. We will soon find that several aspects

of the ceremony are subject to moral scrutiny; retrospectively, this poses a series of questions for the reader. How are we to regard the wealthy materials of the ceremony here (especially gold, purple and ivory) once Janus has offered the view that early Rome's moral simplicity has given way to an immoral infatuation with riches (193–226n.)? When Ovid later reminisces on the Golden Age of divine worship before the import of foreign incense (337–48n.), how are we to view the foreign saffron of this ceremony (76)? How can Ovid's subsequent empathy for the suffering of animals and his criticism of live sacrifice (349–456n.) be reconciled with the animal sacrifice involved in this ceremony (83–4)? What emerges during Book 1 is that the positive interpretation of Roman ritual procedure expressed in 75–88 is only one of a series of competing views in operation. On one level therefore, the specific elements of ritual highlighted in this section serve as thematic signposts to other parts of Book 1.

75–6 The atmosphere of the occasion is immediately brought before our senses by the focus on smell (*odoratis*), bright colour (juxtaposition of *luceat ignibus*) and sound (*sonet*). The alliteration of 'c' and 's' in line 76 is very noticeable, and aptly conveys the hissing of the saffron on the hearth; for a similar usage of alliteration, cf. Tib. 2.5.81–2 *et succensa sacris crepitet bene laurea flammis/omine quo felix et satur annus erit.*

75 cernis . . . ut: it is typical of mimetic representation of festivals to direct the audience's attention to a particular sight; cf. e.g. Call. *Ap.* 4, Tib. 2.1.15, 25–6 *viden ut felicibus extis/significet placidos nuntia fibra deos?* (Ambarvalia).

76 accensis . . . focis "hearths on which fire has been placed": for *accendo* in the specific sense *imponere ignem*, cf. *Med.* 84, Liv. 2.12.13, Plin. *Nat.* 15.135, *Thes.* 1.275.9ff.

spica Cilissa, 'the Cilician spike', refers to saffron, the best of which was considered to grow in the Asian province of Cilicia; cf. *Ars* 3.204, Plin. *Nat.* 21.31; see also 75–88n., 342n. Its usage in ritual is elsewhere attested by Propertius, where the plant is applied to the bard's hair; cf. Prop. 4.6.74 *terque lavet nostras spica Cilissa comas.*

77 verberat: for the use of *verbero* to describe the intermittent 'striking' of light on to a surface; cf. Sen. *Nat.* 1.8.3 (sunlight 'strikes' a cloud), Plin. *Nat.* 14.136 *Campaniae nobilissima exposita sub diu in cadis verberari sole, luna, imbre, ventis aptissimum videtur*, *OLD* s.v. 3b.

aurum: for the use of gilding and gold leaf on temples, cf. V. Max. 2.4.6, Plin. *Nat.* 36.114. This is one of a number of references

which bear witness to the luxury present in Rome; cf. also *spica Cilissa* (76), *purpura* (81), *ebur* (82). This may lay the ceremony open to criticism later in the Book (see 75–88n.).

78 et tremulum summa spargit in aede iubar "and scatters its flickering beam on to the top of the temple": Ovid means either that the flame reaches as high as the top of the temple or, more likely, that the shadow cast by the flame reaches the heights. Either way, it was recognised as a good omen if the flame from the altar reached high; cf. e.g. *Met.* 10.278–9, Verg. *G.* 4.385 *ter flamma ad summum tecti subiecta reluxit* (Aristaeus cheered by a good omen), Stat. *Silv.* 4.1.23–4, Dio 37.35.4. The use of *tremulus* to describe the flickering of light is well-established by Ovid's time—cf. e.g. Enn. *Trag.* fr. 122 J. *lumine . . . tremulo*, Lucr. 4.404, Verg. *Ecl.* 8.105, *A.* 7.9—but the specific phrase *tremulum iubar* is found previously only at Lucr. 5.697: *sub terris ideo tremulum iubar haesitat ignis.*

79–80 Ovid begins to describe the ceremonial procession up to the Capitol, but the manner of expression is distinctly impersonal: note the impersonal passive *itur* (79) and the way in which the people are only evoked in terms of the mass of unified colour that they produce (80); see 75–88n.

79 vestibus intactis "in pure white clothing": it was customary for white to be worn on religious occasions; cf. 2.654, 4.619–20 *alba decent Cererem: vestes Cerialibus albas/sumite,* 4.906, Pl. *Rud.* 270, Cic. *Leg.* 2.45 *color autem albus praecipue decorus deo est,* Hor. *S.* 2.2.61, Tib. 2.1.16.

Thes. 7.1.2067.42 suggests that *intactus* is not used elsewhere to refer to whiteness (lit. 'untouched' (by dye)). It does, however, convey the same senses of moral and visual purity as the more common *purus* in such contexts; cf. e.g. Tib. 1.10.27, 2.1.13 *pura cum veste venite, OLD* s.v. 3, 8.

Tarpeias . . . in arces: the Tarpeian Rock, from which Roman traitors were traditionally thrown, formed part of the Capitol. However, the adjective *Tarpeius* is often used in an extended sense to refer to the whole hill; cf. 6.34, *Pont.* 2.1.57 *te quoque victorem Tarpeias scandere in arces/. . . Roma videbit* (prophecy of Germanicus' triumph), 4.4.29, 4.9.29, *Met.* 15.866, Verg. *A.* 8.347, Prop. 4.1.7, also Var. *L.* 5.41 (a suggestion that the hill was called Tarpeian before it was called Capitoline), Platner/Ashby 509–10.

80 concolor "the same colour as": cf. *Met.* 11.499–500, *Hal.* 103, 124, Col. 7.3.1 *sed etiam si palatum atque lingua concolor lanae est, Thes.* 4.81.23ff.

81–2 Ovid describes the procession in order. First come the lictors, who carry the *fasces*, followed by the consuls themselves in their togas bordered with the magisterial purple. When they reach the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, the consuls take their place on the ivory curule chairs. However, with no reference to human participants at all in this couplet, we are invited to view the scene as a procession of insignia, precious material, brightness and colour; see 75–88n.

81 fasces: these were the bundles of rods and axes, the insignia of the magistrates, which were carried by the lictors at the head of the procession; cf. e.g. *Pont.* 4.9.41–2, Cic. *Q.* 1.1.13 *sit lictor . . . tuae lenitatis apparitor, maioraque praeferant fasces illi ac secures dignitatis insignia quam potestatis*, Liv. 21.63.9.

purpura: this metonym for the consular toga, which aptly keeps the focus on colour, appears not to be found before Ovid; cf. *Pont.* 4.4.25 *purpura Pompeium summi velabit honoris*, 4.9.26, Stat. *Silv.* 4.1.1, Sil. 14.112.

82 conspicuum . . . ebur: *ebur* is here a metonym for the ivory curule chair; cf. 5.51, *Pont.* 4.5.18 *conspicuum signis cum premet altus ebur*, Hor. *Ep.* 1.6.54, Stat. *Silv.* 1.2.180, *Thes.* 5.2.21.54ff. As at *Pont.* 4.5.18, *conspicuum* here is best taken in the sense 'splendid' (*OLD* s.v.2), alluding to the chair's brightness and ornate quality.

pondera sentit ebur: an unusual and impersonalised way of referring to the new consul; see 75–88n. It does, however, strike a suitably solemn note: expressions of physical weightiness are often attached to persons of great significance, particularly gods; cf. e.g. Hom. *Il.* 5.838–9 (Athene in Diomedes' chariot), Verg. *A.* 6.413–14 (Aeneas in Charon's boat), Luc. 1.56–7 (Nero).

83–4 Ovid turns his attention to the consuls' sacrificing of animals to Jupiter. *rudes operum* recalls the fact that animals destined for sacrificial purposes were set apart from other livestock and not sent to work on the land; cf. e.g. 3.375–6 *tollit humo munus caesa prius ille iuvenca/quae dederat nulli colla premenda iugo*, 4.335–6, Verg. *G.* 3.157–61. It was customary for white victims to be offered to the heavenly gods; see 84n., 720n.

83 colla . . . praebent: for the phraseology, cf. 4.403 *illa iugo tauros collum praebere coegit*, *Tr.* 4.6.2, Sen. *Med.* 1023–4, *Thes.* 10.2.387.34ff. The sentiment suggests an acceptance, even a willingness on the part of the animals to perform their duty in the ceremony. Ovid will, however, offer a quite different view when he empathises with the miserable plight of sacrificial animals; cf. 323, 327, 349–456n.

iuvenci: the plural alludes to the fact that two animals were typically sacrificed, one by each consul; cf. Liv. 41.14.7 *Cn. Cornelio et Q. Petilio consulibus . . . immolantibus Iovi singulis bubus uti solet.*

84 quos aluit campis herba Falisca suis: a favourite Ovidian clause for describing the upbringing of Roman sacrificial animals; cf. *Am.* 3.13.14 (rite of Juno), *Pont.* 4.4.31–2 *colla boves niveos certae praebere securi,/quos aluit campis herba Falisca suis* (consular inauguration of Sextus Pompeius). Falerii, a city in Etruria, was considered one of the best places to rear splendid white animals, and it was even rumoured that its waters could turn the animals white; cf. *Pont.* 4.8.41 *agnaque tam lactens quam gramine pasta Falisco,* Plin. *Nat.* 2.230.

85–6 Iuppiter arce sua totum cum spectet in orbem,/nil nisi Romanum, quod tueatur, habet "When Jupiter from his own citadel looks upon the whole earth, he finds nothing upon which to gaze unless it is Roman": the focus on the perceived favourable reaction of the gods—here the recipient of the sacrifice, Jupiter—is characteristic of later accounts of inaugural consular ceremonies; cf. *Pont.* 4.9.29–32, Stat. *Silv.* 4.1.45–7, Claud. *Carm.* 1.226ff., Du Quesnay (1977) 46. Jupiter is perceived to be looking down from either his heavenly citadel (for which, cf. e.g. *Met.* 1.163, 15.858–9) or the citadel on the Capitol (Edwards (1996) 86–8). Either way, Ovid expresses the common conceit that Rome is tantamount to the whole world, a sentiment often made by playing on the similarity between *Urbs* and *orbis*; cf. 2.135–8, 2.684 *Romanae spatium est Urbis et orbis idem, Tr.* 1.5.69–70, 3.7.51–2, Prop. 3.11.57, Hardie (1986) 364–6. For the (virtually) redundant use of *habet,* see 196n.

87–8 Ovid concludes the section appropriately with rejoicing and prayer. National rejoicing on the day of the inaugural consular ceremony is a common feature of later accounts of the event, where it is testimony to the approval of the appointment of certain consuls; cf. Stat. *Silv.* 4.1.5–8 *exsultent leges Latiae, gaudete, curules,/et septemgemino iactantior aethera pulset/Roma iugo* (Domitian), Claud. *Carm.* 1.266 (Probinus and Olybrius), 16.270ff. (Manlius Theodorus), 28.611ff. (Honorius). However, as Ovid is not intent on praising a specific consul in this section (see 75–88n.), he offers more general praise of the splendid day and the powerful Romans who are worthy of celebrating it (88).

87 salve, laeta dies, meliorque revertere semper: for this style of celebration, cf. Tib. 1.7.63–4 *at tu, Natalis multos celebrande per annos,/candidior semper candidiorque veni* (Messalla's birthday), Mart.

4.1.1–4 (Domitian's birthday). For *salve* as a standard ritual greeting, see 509n.

89–288 Conversation between Janus and poet

i. *Structure*

The following is a working structure for the episode (for a slightly different structure, see Hardie (1991) 48):

89–98 Epiphany of Janus

99–144 Janus answers questions about his nature: etymologies of his name and reasons for his double shape

- i) 99–114 Janus as god of Chaos
- ii) 115–44 Janus as celestial doorkeeper

145–88 Janus answers various questions about his association with beginnings and the first day of the year

- i) 145–64 the year begins in midwinter
- ii) 165–70 'mock' work is undertaken on 1st January
- iii) 171–4 offerings are made first to Janus
- iv) 175–82 good words are uttered on 1st January
- v) 183–8 sweet things are given on 1st January

189–286 Janus answers questions which cover his role in the history of Rome

- i) 189–226 bronze coins are given on 1st January; digression on Roman moral degeneration
- ii) 227–54 the impressions of a two-headed figure and a ship on the *as*; the story of Saturn's arrival into Italy during Janus' reign
- iii) 255–76 aetiology of the temple of Janus Geminus; the story of Janus' salvation of Rome from Sabine attack
- iv) 277–86 symbolism of the opening and closing of the temple doors; triumph of Germanicus

287–8 Closing prayer to Janus

ii. *Janus: Ancient Impressions of the God*

In lines 89–90, Ovid asks, 'what god am I to say you are, o double-shaped Janus?' This is more than just a literary device to introduce the section: it aptly reflects the apparent difficulty for the Romans in constructing a consistent picture of their god. This is best demonstrated by the fifth century A.D. commentator Macrobius, whose detailed discussion of the nature of Janus (1.9)—the only major treatment outside Ovid's section here—bears witness to the variety of conflicting interpretations. Janus' primary duties range from lowly celestial doorkeeper (1.9.9) to powerful controller of time and beginnings (1.9.10); he may be god of gods (1.9.14) or perhaps not even an independent deity at all, but an alternative name for Apollo and Diana (1.9.5–8) or the sky (1.9.9); he is traditionally credited with two faces, but he may have four (1.9.13); for discussions of this complex deity, see Schilling (1960); Holland (1961) esp. 265–85, 301–9; Meslin (1970) 14–22; Dumézil (1970) 327–33; F. Graf (1998), *Der Neue Pauly Enzyklopädie der Antike*, 858–61. The prospect of an interview between poet and Janus might, therefore, have been particularly welcomed: from the god himself, we might be justified in thinking that we will receive some definitive answers.

Janus' responses to the burning questions are, however, disappointing in the sense that he can only confirm the mystery that surrounds him. He offers or alludes to three different etymologies for his name (from *Chaos* [103n.], *ianua* and *ire* [127n.]); he gives two reasons for his double form (see 113–14n., 143–4n.); he is unsure of his primary role and associates himself with a whole range of concepts/deities (the universe [105–10n., 112n.], the Sun/Apollo [125n., 140n.], Hecate [141–2n.], the doorkeeper [125n.]); he offers two reasons for the symbolism surrounding his temple (see 121–4nn., 279–82nn.). In effect, Janus mouths the competing theories of Ovid's own day, entertained by the likes of Varro, Nigidius Figulus, Cicero and Verrius Flaccus. As such, he remains as elusive as the god Vertumnus in Propertius 4.2 who, speaking directly to the poet, mouths different etymologies of his name and function without real preference; cf. Prop. 4.2.10 (*verso . . . amne*), 11 (*vertentis . . . anni*), 47 (*vertebar in omnis*), 57 (*versus?*); see Shea (1988).

The significance of Janus in the Augustan Age is also unclear. Augustus was certainly interested in the temple of Janus Geminus/Quirinus for its symbolic association with the maintenance of peace. Most famously, in the *Res Gestae* (13), he is keen to tell us that that

the temple was closed three times during his reign; for the problems of dating these closures, see Herbert-Brown (1994) 187–96. However, beyond this, Augustus appears to make little use of Janus—his temple is only renovated later, by Tiberius, in A.D. 17 (Tac. *Ann.* 2.49), and the god makes no iconographic appearance on monuments for which he would have been well-suited, for example, the *Ara Pacis*. It is, therefore, far from certain that Janus experienced any significant 'revival' in the imperial period; see Turcan (1981) 375–80. That said, Ovid's dealings with Janus would have been welcomed for their focus on peace under the imperial family; see 282n., 285–6n.

iii. *The Interview Technique: Style and Characterisation*

The interview style adopted in this section is employed frequently in the poem with varying degrees of intensity; cf. 659–62 (Muse); 3.167–258 (Mars); 697–710 (Vesta); 4.1–18 (Venus); 181–372 (Erato); 377–84 (elderly man); 689–712 (old friend); 905–42 (priest); 5.1–110 (Muses); 183–378 (Flora); 445–92 (Mercury); 635–62 (Tiber); 693–720 (Mercury); 6.9–96 (Juno, Iuventas and Concordia); 213–18 (Sancus); 225–34 (priest); 395–416 (old woman); 652–710 (Minerva); 798–810 (Clio). It is a technique inspired by Callimachus' *Aetia*, in which the poet regularly converses with various informants, particularly the Muses in Books 1 and 2; cf. Call. *Aet.* fr. 43 Pf. (Clio), fr. 114 Pf. (statue of Apollo), frr. 178–84 Pf. (dinner guest), Cameron (1995) 104–9.

On a practical level, this interview technique allows the poet to compose a more coherent narrative out of otherwise diverse stories and exegetic information. But the technique also affords an opportunity for subtle characterisation and character development, which Ovid takes to the full. First, Ovid allows the informants (particularly the deities) to exhibit their own personalities; consequently, their discourse often reveals their own self-interests; for discussions, see Miller (1983); Harries (1989) 167ff.; Newlands (1995) esp. 51–86; Barchiesi (1997) *passim*. Janus himself clearly comes across as a character who is jovial (103n., 113–14n., 129n., 131–2n., 143–4n., 191–2n.), prone to light-hearted boasting about his powers (103n., 117–20nn., 125n., 126n., 268n., 269n.) and, as an ancient being, keen to reminisce and exaggerate (193–226n., 229–54n.). He also articulates himself in a manner which betrays his own interests: in retelling the myth of the repulsion of the Sabines from Rome, he emphasises peace and employs

language appropriate for a doorkeeper; see 272n.; see also 120n.

Nor is Ovid in his capacity as interviewer a colourless character. He has a tendency to listen with wonder (165n.) and ask questions eagerly (89–92n., 171n., 183–4n., 189–90n.). He also starts out in the poem as a somewhat naïve and tactless interviewer before developing his skills as the poem progresses; see 149–60n., 168n., 191–2n.

iv. *Janus and Fasti: a symbiotic link*

The Janus episode represents both the first and the longest appearance of any character, deity or mortal, in the poem. The privileged position afforded Janus in the poem is no accident. Recent scholarship has revealed that there are many complex lines of interaction between the deity and the workings of the poem itself; see esp. Miller (1983) 164–74; Barchiesi (1991) 14–17, (1997) 230–7; Hardie (1991) 60–4; Newlands (1995) 6–7. Janus is not only a character in his own right: he has something to say about the poem as a whole.

It is, of course, entirely appropriate for the poet to invoke Janus, at the beginning of January, to ask him questions about himself and the month over which he presides. But Janus is suitable in other ways as well. Janus is simultaneously god of January, initiator of the year (65), celestial doorkeeper (125–7), god of beginnings and traditionally first to be invoked in Roman prayers (173–4). He is, therefore, an ideal candidate for the poet to call upon to welcome us into a poem as a whole. He is, furthermore, the most ancient authority on any matter (he was Chaos (103)); in effect, he represents a better source of inspiration for a Roman aetiological poem than the traditional Muses.

Janus is also closely associated with the workings of the poem and its poet; see esp. 103–4n. At times, he seems to operate in a manner which recalls a poet composing poetry: this is particularly apparent in the story of his expulsion of the Sabines from Rome (259–76), in which Janus' actions are strongly reminiscent of that of a poet; see 268n., 269–70n. At other times, Janus' behaviour encourages us view him as a personification of the poem itself. The most compelling example of this is when, at one point, Janus is said to be articulating himself in an elegiac couplet (162n.). But the personification runs deeper than this. Janus reflects the 'didactic mode' of some of the poem by using expressions which are regularly used by the didactic poet himself; see 101n., 115n., 133n., 227n., 229n., 233n.; for the

'didactic façade' of *Fasti*, see 27–62n. Janus also reflects the generic considerations of this elegiac poem. His constant attempts to promote peace over warfare and arms (253–4nn., 259–76n.) reflect Ovid's own purported agenda for the poem; see 13–14n. Most interestingly, Janus' 'double form', which is constantly brought to our attention—see 65n., 66n., 89n., 92n., 95n., 101–44n., 102n.—can be read as a complex stylistic manifesto. It anticipates the polyphony of the poem as a whole—for example, the fusion of the serious and the humorous, the panegyric and the subversive—and asks of the reader a 'bifocal' approach. As such, Janus performs a similar poetic and programmatic function to the god Vertumnus at the beginning of Propertius' aetiological book (Prop. 4.2); see esp. Shea (1988); Debrohun (1994) 53–6; Myers (1994) 127–8.

89–92 Ovid's initial enquiry to Janus takes the form of a two-part question: how best to refer to him (89–90) and what the reason is for his shape (91–2). This double enquiry, indicative of the questioner's enthusiasm, is also a feature of the interviewer in Callimachus' *Aetia*; cf. fr. 7.19–21 Pf. (Callimachus to Calliope). Janus will give two answers to each part of the question in order: two reasons for his name (103, 125–7) and two for his shape (105–14, 115–44).

89 quem tamen esse deum te dicam: though this represents a 'genuine' enquiry (see 89–288 (ii) n.), it is also a variation of the standard respectful way of addressing a deity (*quisquis es*/ὅστις ποτ' εἶ); cf. e.g. Aesch. *Ag.* 160, Verg. *A.* 1.387 *quisquis es, haud, credo, invisus caelestibus auras/vitalis carpis, Tyriam qui adveneris urbem*, Appel (1909) 78–9, Norden (1956) 143–7.

biformis: though the adjective is used occasionally elsewhere of Janus (cf. 5.424, Sept. *poet.* fr. 23.1), this very general description of the god may be an attempt at naivety from a poet in his guise as ignorant questioner; for a similar technique, see Fantham on 4.219 *turrifera.*

92 The symmetry of the line, based around the anaphora of *sitque quod*, reflects the physical symmetry of the two-headed Janus.

93–100 Ovid switches from direct questions to past narrative, as he recalls the arrival of Janus at his house (possibly on the Capitol (243–4n.)) to answer the questions personally.

The arrival of a deity before a mortal (theophany) is a motif which is found as early as Homer; cf. e.g. Hom. *Il.* 24.120ff., *Od.* 1.102ff., Liv. 1.16.6ff., Verg. *A.* 4.259ff., Hor. *S.* 1.10.31ff.; for the motif in Ovid, cf. *Am.* 3.1.1ff., *Her.* 16.57ff., *Ars* 2.493ff., 3.43ff., *Rem.* 549ff.,

Pont. 3.3.5ff.; A. Henderson (1983), "*Manifestus Deus*: Il Motivo della Teofania nella poesia d'Amore di Ovidio", *Ovidiana* 6, Sulmo. More specifically in this instance, the arrival of a deity to inspire a poet goes back to Hesiod's encounter with the Muses; cf. e.g. Hes. *Th.* 22–34 (Muses), Call. *Aet.* fr. 1.21ff. Pf. (Apollo), Verg. *Ecl.* 6.3ff. (Apollo), 64ff. (Muses), Prop. 3.3 (Apollo), Nisbet/Hubbard's introduction to Hor. *Carm.* 2.19. Such epiphanies are particularly common in *Fasti*, where a variety of divine informants make themselves accessible to face-to-face questioning; see 89–288 (iii) n.

That said, detailed description of the actual process of theophany from the perspective of the mortal viewer is much rarer; in fact, this is by far the most elaborate description of theophany in *Fasti*. Elsewhere, the transition between the poet's questioning and the arrival of the deity is abrupt; cf. e.g. 3.171 *sic ego. sic posita dixit mihi casside Mavors*, 5.193 *sic ego; sic nostris respondit diva rogatis* (Flora). It is, however, particularly fitting that Ovid should choose to elaborate on this theophany: having already revealed his fascination with the god's physical form (see 65–6n.), it is only natural that the poet should revel in the moment when this wondrous deity first meets his eyes.

93 haec . . . cum . . . agitarem mente "while I was turning these things over in my mind": for the expression, cf. e.g. *Her.* 18.54, Liv. 7.35.3 *nunc quae mente agitem audite*, *OLD* s.v. 17a.

sumptis . . . tabellis: an allusion to the beginning of Callimachus' *Aetia*, where, in similar fashion, the poet is visited by an informative deity (Apollo) while he is holding his writing-tablets; cf. Call. *Aet.* fr. 1.21–2 Pf. καὶ γὰρ ὅτε πρώτιστον ἐμοῖς ἐπὶ δέλτον ἔθηκα/γούνασιν, Ἀπόλλων εἶπεν ὅ μοι Λύκιος.

94 lucidior: the imminent arrival of Janus is anticipated by the reference to bright light, which commonly accompanies a deity; cf. e.g. *Ars* 3.55–6 *sensimus acceptis numen quoque: purior aether/fulsit*, Hom. *h. Cer.* 277ff. (Demeter), Call. *Ap.* 9 (Apollo), Pl. *Am.* 1112, 1142–3 (Jupiter), Verg. *A.* 2.590–1 *pura per noctem in luce refulsit/alma parens* (Venus), 9.19–20 (Iris).

visa est: a note of uncertainty is entirely appropriate for a mortal relating a supernatural occurrence; cf. *Her.* 16.59 *pedum pulsa visa est mihi terra movere* (Mercury's appearance to Paris), *Rem.* 555–6, *Pont.* 3.3.18; see also 469n.

95 The suspense of the moment is conveyed by the delaying of the name *Ianus* until after a succession of clues as to the identity of the guest: he is holy (*sacer*), wondrous (*mirandus*) and two-headed (*ancip-*

iti ... *imagine*). For other examples of this ploy in Ovid, cf. 433 with n., *Her.* 16.61–2 *constitit ante oculos actus velocibus alis/Atlantis* ... *nepos* (arrival of Mercury), *Met.* 8.612–13 *irridet credentes, utque deorum/spretor erat mentisque ferox, Ixione natus* (Pirithous).

ancipiti ... imagine: *anceps* can be used as a synonym for *biceps* and is typically used of Janus; cf. *Met.* 14.334 (one of several readings), Maur. *Dig.* 1892 *ancipitem* ... *cantavit* ... *Ianum*, Sid. *Carm.* 7.11, Arnob. *Gent.* 6.25.

96 bina ... oculis ... ora meis: Ovid wittily plays off against each other the reality of his two eyes and Janus' two heads; for similar play, see 66n.

repens: suddenness of arrival is a typical feature of theophanies; cf. *Ars* 2.493–4 *haec ego cum canerem, subito manifestus Apollo/movit inauratae pollice fila lyrae*, Call. *Ap.* 4–5 (Apollo), Herodas 1.9 with Headlam ad loc.

97–8 Ovid's reaction, as sudden as the god's appearance (*repens* (96), *subito* (98)), is one of fear. Fear/awe is a typical and natural reaction for a mortal faced with divine or supernatural presence, and Ovid's expressions regularly detail the mortal's chills and frigid hair; cf. 3.331–2, *Her.* 16.67 *obstupui, gelidusque comas erexerat horror* (Paris in the presence of the divine), *Met.* 3.99–100 *ille diu pavidus pariter cum mente colorem/perdiderat, gelidoque comae terrore rigebant* (Cadmus hearing a supernatural voice), 7.630–1, Verg. *A.* 2.774, 3.48, 4.279–80, Liv. 1.16.6, Sen. *Ep.* 115.4, Luc. 1.192–4, Dio 59.27.6. Ovid may be particularly frightened in this instance in light of Janus' unusually grotesque form, but he will gradually become more comfortable in the god's presence; see 227–8n.

97 sensique metu riguisse capillos: for the commonplace of hair standing on end, usually attributed to fear, cf. Verg. *A.* 4.279–80 *at vero Aeneas aspectu obmutuit amens,/arrectaeque horrore comae et vox faucibus haesit* with Pease ad loc.; see also 97–8n.

99 Now that Ovid has overcome his initial reaction to seeing Janus, he can look beyond his strange form to some of the finer, less wondrous details, such as the items he is holding in his hands. According to Macrobius (1.9.7), the staff and key are Janus' standard possessions, symbolising his roles as guardian of doorways and guide on all roads: *nam [Ianus] et cum clavi ac virga figuratur, quasi omnium et portarum custos et rector viarum*; see also Arnob. *Adv. Nat.* 6.25, Johannes Lydus *Mens.* 4.1.

100 edidit ... ore priore: the phrase *edo ore* is a grand means of expressing speech and often introduces divine utterance; see 434n. The phrase here has been suitably customised for Janus—his *front*

mouth speaks—and reveals again the poet's fascination with the god's physical appearance; see 66n.

101–44 In answer to the questions raised in 89–92, Janus provides two different explanations for his name and shape. His first (101–14) is an 'historical' explanation: he used to be Chaos, from which his name is derived (see 103n.); his double form is a 'small reminder' of this formerly chaotic state (113–14). For his second explanation (115–44), Janus adopts a different rationale. He draws attention to his present function as celestial doorkeeper (117–32), from which his name is derived (see 127n.), and suggests that his double form stems from this present function (133–44): it allows him to look both ways without having to move (143–4).

This second type of exegesis, whereby a given condition/practice is explained in terms of its *suitability* for performing a specific present function, is particularly striking and regularly employed in *Fasti*; cf. e.g. 171–4, 229–32, Miller (1983) 173–4, Pasco-Pranger (2000) 285. By engaging in multiple interpretations, using different rationales and expressing no preference between different explanations, Janus in effect acts as a model for how aetiological discussion will be conducted in the poem; for exegesis in the poem, see 319–32n. It is particularly fitting for the two-headed Janus to be advocating two different explanations. Given that the first explanation starts from the beginning of time and 'looks forward', whilst the second starts from the present and 'looks back', might we not further entertain the possibility that each of Janus' faces is putting forward its own explanation here?

101 disce: the initial imperative from Janus is one which is regularly used by the didactic poet himself; cf. 2.584, 4.140, 145, 6.639, *Ars* 1.50, 3.298 with Gibson ad loc., *Med.* 1, *Rem.* 43 *discite sanari, per quem didicistis amare*, Verg. *G.* 3.414, Man. 2.761; see also 89–288 (iv) n.

vates operose dierum "o industrious bard of days": a grandiose title for the poet of *Fasti*. *vates*, originally a seer who gave prophecy in verse, became in the Augustan period a grand means of referring to the inspired poet; cf. e.g. 25, *Ars* 1.29 *vati parete perito*, Verg. *Ecl.* 9.32–4, Hor. *Carm.* 1.1.35 with Nisbet/Hubbard ad loc., Newman (1967) 99–206; for Ovid's creative use of the term, see Newman (1967) 182ff. This grand title for the poet is given particular weight here and elsewhere by its being uttered by a deity; cf. 3.177 *Latinorum vates operose dierum* (Mars), 6.21 *o vates, Romani conditor anni* (Juno).

As the first direct address to the poet in the poem, some have detected literary and programmatic allusions here. First, the collocation *operose dierum* (also at 3.177) has been seen as an allusion to Hesiod's *Works and Days* (probably known as *Opera et Dies* in Ovid's day), an important precedent for Ovid in terms of both style (didactic) and subject matter (stars, yearly cycle); see Hardie (1991) 59, Barchiesi (1997) 233; see also 311–14 (ii) n. Secondly, the striking juxtaposition of *vates operose* has been seen as programmatic of the way in which Ovid will claim to include material both 'inspired' by higher, divine sources and amassed by painstaking antiquarian research; see Pasco-Pranger (2000).

102 voces . . . meas: though the plural *voces* is a common poetic alternative to *dicta*—cf. e.g. 5.53, *Am.* 1.8.106, Verg. *A.* 2.98, Cat. 64.202—there is an obvious allusion here to Janus' two mouths; for play on Janus' double form, see 66n.

percipe mente: for the idiom, cf. Cic. *Orat.* 2.33, Man. 2.927–8 *nomen erit Fortuna loco, quod percipe mente,/ut brevia in longo compendia carmine praestem, Thes.* 10.1.1211.20ff.

103–4 In giving his credentials as an informant, Janus aligns himself closely to the thematic plan of the poem itself. First, his intention to 'sing the deeds of a long period of time' (*longi temporis acta canam* (104)) mirrors Ovid's own proposal for *Fasti*; cf. 1–2 *tempora . . . canam*. Secondly, Janus identifies himself as an 'ancient thing' (*res prisca* (103)): given Ovid's initial pledge to consult *prisci annales* (7), is this not an (amusing) attempt at conformity on the part of Janus to justify his appearance in the poem?

103 me Chaos antiqui . . . vocabant: though it is not given directly, an etymology for Janus' name is suggested here, but the reader is forced to work hard to detect it. Chaos takes its name from the Greek verb χάσκειν ('to gape'), and the suggestion is that Janus, identified with this phenomenon, takes his name from the Latin equivalent *hiare.* This extravagant etymology may have been an Ovidian innovation (Johannes Lydus *Mens.* 4.2) or else it was suggested by his contemporary Verrius Flaccus; cf. Fest. 45 L. *Chaos appellat Hesiodus (Theog. 116) confusam quandam ab initio unitatem, hiantem patentemque in profundum. ex eo et χάσκειν Graeci, et nos hiare dicimus. Unde Ianus detracta aspiratione nominatur id*; see also Porte (1985) 248–50. Janus' suggestion that he was previously known by a Greek name 'corrects' Ovid's earlier comment (90) that he is an entirely Roman god.

nam sum res prisca: a short aside from the divine speaker to

highlight his unique longevity and hence establish himself as an authority for speaking on ancient matters. The phraseology may remind us of the light-hearted boasts of other divine characters in Ovid—cf. e.g. *Met.* 1.512ff. (Apollo), 2.742–4 (Mercury), 4.226ff. *ille ego sum . . . qui longum metior annum* (Sun), 13.917ff. (Glaucus), also Prop. 4.9.37–8 (Hercules)—and helps to characterise Janus as a friendly and jovial informant who is proud of his achievements and status; see 89–288 (iii) n.; see also 103–4n.

105–10 Janus proceeds to relate the transformation of the universe from its once chaotic state (105–6) to the eventual separation and relocation of the four elements fire, air, water and earth (107–10). There are, broadly speaking, two different systems of cosmogony. The first is the mythological interpretation of the world, going back to Hesiod (*Th.* 116), in which Chaos is identified as bringing about the birth of the gods; cf. Verg. *G.* 4.347. The second is the philosophical interpretation of the world (not found before the Ionic philosopher Anaximander) in terms of the separation of the primeval elements, either by random collision (Epicureanism) or by some divine design (Stoicism); for the relationship between the two systems of cosmogony, see Hardie (1986) 5–32. By the time of the Roman poets, cosmogony has become a popular topic; cf. 5.11ff.; *Ars* 2.467ff. with Janka ad loc.; *Met.* 1.5ff., 15.239–43; Lucr. 5.416–508 with Bailey ad loc.; Verg. *Ecl.* 6.31–40; West on Hes. *Th.* 116.

Interestingly, Janus presents a cosmogony which incorporates both systems of thought. For the most part, he offers a philosophical interpretation of the world, in a manner which recalls Lucretius in particular; see Porte (1985) 338–40 and individual nn. However, the irony is that this is all set within a (non-Lucretian) mythological framework: it is a *god* who is telling the story and, given his identification with Chaos, an eyewitness to the whole phenomenon; moreover, the cosmogony ultimately acts as a *theogony*, in that Janus describes himself as the divine embodiment of this new world order; see nn. One might expect the 'two-faced' Janus to offer such a mixed account, but it is worth noting that poets often play with competing cosmogonical ideas; cf. *Met.* 1.5ff. (mixture of philosophy and mythology) with Myers (1994) 41–3; Ap. Rhod. 1.496ff. with Hardie (1986) 13; Verg. *Ecl.* 6.31–40 with Coleman ad loc.

On a generic note, cosmogony is regarded as a grand topic and is typically found at the beginning of works of high poetry, partic-

ularly epic; cf. *Met.* 1.5ff.; Hom. *Il.* 18.483ff.; Hes. *Th.* 116ff.; Call. *Aet.* fr. 2.3 Pf. (recalling Hesiod); Ap. Rhod. 1.496ff. (song of Orpheus); Verg. *Ecl.* 6.31–40 (lofty song of Silenus); *A.* 1.740ff. (song of Iopas). As such, the presence of a cosmogony here intimates that *Fasti* is a work of lofty status; see Myers (1994) 5–15 esp. 13.

105 lucidus . . . aer: a phrase first found in Lucretius; cf. Lucr. 4.315 *insequitur candens confestim lucidus aer*, Sen. *Nat.* 1.1.15, 2.10.1, *Thes.* 7.2.1705.49ff.

corpora: in the scientific sense of the four 'primeval elements'; cf. e.g. 5.11, *Met.* 15.239, Cic. *Tusc.* 1.40, *Tim.* 50, Lucr. 1.58, 2.63, *Thes.* 4.1024.11ff.

106 ignis, aquae, tellus: the harsh asyndeton effectively conveys the idea of an indiscriminate amalgam of elements; for a similar use of this technique, cf. *Ars* 2.467–8 *prima fuit rerum confusa sine ordine moles,/unaque erat facies sidera, terra, fretum.*

acervus is elsewhere used of the confused order of the primeval elements before their separation; cf. *Met.* 1.24, Lucr. 1.775–6 *quippe suam quidque in coetu variantis acervi/naturam ostendet, Aetna* 247.

107 rerum . . . lite suarum: the discord between the various opposing elements of Chaos, which causes their ultimate separation, is grandly expressed in Lucretius; cf. 5.432ff. esp. 440–2 *discordia quorum/intervalla vias conexus pondera plagas/concursus motus turbabat proelia miscens.* Ovid here and elsewhere refers to this discord by the legal term *lis* ('lawsuit'); cf. *Met.* 1.21 *hanc deus et melior litem natura diremit*; for Ovid's use of legal terminology elsewhere, see 359n., Kenney (1969) 250–63; for *lis* used of other 'disputes' between inanimate entities, cf. *Her.* 16.290, Plin. *Nat.* 9.169, *Thes.* 7.2.1500.48ff. The presence of *rerum* and the doubly ponderous genitive plurals echo Lucretian phraseology; see 62n.

108 massa soluta: *massa* is used of the primeval amalgamation of elements only here (*Thes.* 8.430.48–9). For *solvo* in the sense 'dissolve, break up into parts', cf. *Met.* 15.845, Lucr. 1.1017–18 *nam dispulsa suo de coetu materiai/copia ferretur magnum per inane soluta*, 1103, 6.235, *OLD* s.v. 11, 12.

domos: the metaphorical use of *domus* to refer to the location of inanimate entities is not found before Ovid; cf. *Met.* 15.458, *Tr.* 1.1.106, *Aetna* 410, *OLD* s.v.5, *Thes.* 5.1.1972.57ff. This sentimentalising touch provides relief from the predominantly philosophical register of Janus' cosmogony.

109–10 The separation and relocation of the elements on the basis of their respective weights is also described at *Met.* 1.26–31 and, more fully, by Lucretius (5.449–70, 495–505).

109 flamma petit altum "fire sought the heights": fire is considered the lightest of the four elements and makes its home in the upper air, the ether or 'heaven' (as opposed to the sky immediately above the earth, which is occupied by *aer* (109)); cf. *Met.* 1.26 *ignea convexi vis et sine pondere caeli/emicuit summaque locum sibi fecit in arce,* 15.243, Lucr. 5.457–9, Verg. *Ecl.* 6.33. For this rare, contracted form of the perfect of *peto,* cf. *Met.* 5.460, Sen. *Med.* 248, *Her. F.* 825, *OLD* s.v.

110 medio . . . solo "the ground in the middle [i.e. of the universe]": Janus here promotes the contemporary philosophical theory that the earth was a stationary sphere in the middle of the universe, of which humans could only see the upper hemisphere; for the theory, cf. 6.273; Plat. *Phaedo* 108d–109a; Lucr. 5.449–51 *quippe etenim primum terrai corpora quaeque/ . . . coibant/in medio atque imas capiebant omnia sedes* with Bailey ad loc.; Plu. *Mor.* 874a.

111 globus et sine imagine moles: Janus identifies himself with Chaos (see 103n.), in language which recalls previous accounts of the void; cf. *Ars* 2.467 *prima fuit rerum confusa sine ordine moles, Met.* 1.6–7 *unus erat toto naturae vultus in orbe/quem dixere Chaos, rudis indigestaque moles,* 1.87 *sic, modo quae fuerat rudis et sine imagine, tellus,* Lucr. 5.436.

112 redii: a curious choice of verb, given that Janus appears not to be *reverting* to a (former) shape, but taking on a new shape. Scholars tend to translate *redeo* as if the prefix were redundant (see Lewis/Short s.v. II.1), but this works against Ovid's standard usage of the verb in this context; cf. 374 *in sua membra redit* (Proteus reverting to a former shape), *Met.* 4.231 *in veram rediit speciem* (Phoebus), 14.766 (Vertumnus), *Rem.* 623. Perhaps Janus has a more specific chain of thought here. Does he mean that he was first a solid (albeit faceless) mass, then in a state of flux while the elements were separating and resettling, and now *reverting* to a solid shape again, albeit different?

dignaque membra deo: Janus appears to mark his transition from Chaos to present state as a transition from inanimate substance (in which he had no control of affairs) to living deity, with a shape to match this new status. Other commentators suggest rather that Janus was the organising force behind Chaos; cf. Fest. 45 L. *(Ianus) a quo rerum omnium factum putabant initium,* Macr. 1.9.14, Porte (1985) 337. As well as bodily 'limbs', *membra* is commonly used to describe

the 'limbs' of the earth when it first formed after Chaos; cf. Cic. *Tim.* 22, Lucr. 5.443–5 *diffugere inde loci partes coepere paresque/cum paribus iungi res . . . /membraque dividere et magnas disponere partes*, *Met.* 1.32–3 *sic ubi dispositam quisquis fuit ille deorum/congeriem secuit sectamque in membra redegit*, *Thes.* 8.643.55ff. As such, one might be tempted to see Janus as the 'embodiment' of the world.

113–14 Janus' first reasoning for his dual shape is novel and light-hearted. He plays down its strangeness by calling it a *nota parva* of his formerly chaotic state: is this an (amusing) instance of rationalising on the part of the god, given that his former shape meant that *all* his sides were the same (*globus* (111))?

Janus will later conclude another aetiology of his shape with an amusing note: his shape saves the old deity from wasting time by turning round (143–4). It is very interesting to note that both these explanations are novel, when one takes into account the range of explanations entertained in antiquity for the god's dual form; cf. e.g. Macr. 1.7.19–20; *anth.* I.1.347.5–6 (ability to see into the past and the future); Serv. *A.* 1.291 (fusion of two kingdoms); Johannes Lydus *Mens.* 4.2 (ability to look back to the past year and forward to the coming one); Porte (1985) 111–12. In effect, Janus' comments add to, rather than dispel the mystery surrounding his shape.

114 ante quod est in me postque videtur idem: Janus phrases his response in a manner which recalls Ovid's initial question (*cur . . . sitque quod a tergo sitque quod ante vides* (91–2)); for another example, see 239n.

115–16 Janus unexpectedly embarks on another, quite separate explanation of his dual form; see 101–44n. But this new explanation will carry with it the additional benefit of allowing Janus to draw attention to (and flaunt) his divine duties: *simul ut noris officiumque meum.* In effect, the god highlights the flexibility of exegesis which can be directed towards the specific purpose of the clever speaker; see 319–32n.

115 accipe: used by the divine instructor here, this is a standard imperative of the didactic poet; cf. e.g. 2.514, 5.449–50, *Rem.* 292, Lucr. 1.269, 4.722; see also 89–288 (iv) n.

117–20 Janus proceeds to explain his primary role as opener and guardian of all things in the universe. He highlights the exclusive nature of his power—*me penes est unum* (119)—to keep his response in line with Ovid's initial enquiry (why Janus is the *only* god to look both ways (89–90)). Janus does, however, allow himself some indulgence

as he highlights the vastness of his power: juxtaposition of *quicquid ubique* (117), *omnia* (118), *vasti* . . . *mundi* (119), *ius* . . . *omne meum est* (120); see also 89–288 (iii) n.

117 caelum, mare, nubila, terras: to distinguish the four elements here, we should perhaps understand *caelum* as 'heaven' and *nubila* as 'clouds, upper reaches of the visible air', though this would limit the sense of *vides* (117). The asyndeton here helps to convey a sense of boundless sovereignty.

118 omnia sunt nostra clausa patentque manu: Janus' statement of the exclusiveness of his power is exaggerated: we later learn that he has bestowed on the nymph Carna, as compensation for raping her, an ability to open doors; cf. 6.101–2 *prima dies tibi, Carna, datur. dea cardinis haec est:/numine clausa aperit, claudit aperta suo.*

119 me penes: a grand expression of power; see 531n.

120 et ius vertendi cardinis omne meum est "and the power to turn the (celestial) hinge is all mine": *cardinem vertere*, a standard idiom to express the opening of earthly doors, is regularly transferred to the sky to represent the movement of the two axles of the world; cf. *Pont.* 2.10.45, Cic. *Arat.* 24, Man. 1.449 [*sidera*] *nusquam in conspectum redeuntia cardine verso*, Sen. *Phaed.* 963 *celerique polos cardine versas*, *Thy.* 877, *Thes.* 3.443.80ff. In light of his primary role as doorkeeper (125n.), it is only natural for Janus to express his power in the universe in terms of the turning of a hinge.

121–4 Janus focuses specifically on his control over human affairs: he is responsible for letting Peace out into the world (121–2) and for confining Wars (123–4). There is good reason to suggest that Janus is specifically alluding to the temple of Janus Geminus/Quirinus (for which, see 257–8n.). First, a physical structure is suggested by *tectis* [121] (the 'dwelling' for *Pax*) and *rigidae* . . . *serae* [124] ('strong bolts'). Secondly, the imagery in 123–4 is consistent with symbolism surrounding the temple. Previous references to the temple suggest that peace comes about when a destructive force (here *Bella*) is kept barred within its precincts; cf. Enn. *Ann.* 225–6 Sk. (*Discordia*), Verg. *A.* 1.293–6 (*Furor*), Green (2000); see also 279–82n. For different interpretations, see Miller (1983) 165 n. 26 (*Pax* in 121–2 is to be understood as leaving her heavenly dwelling to walk on earth); Schilling ad loc. (121–4 constitute a general statement of Janus' power over human affairs).

121–2 If we take these lines as an allusion to the Temple of Janus Geminus/Quirinus, peace is defined here in terms of the goddess *Pax* leaving the temple and wandering at leisure outside. This would

appear to be an Ovidian contribution to the multiple interpretations surrounding the temple; see Green (2000).

122 libera perpetuas ambulat illa vias "she freely wanders the streets uninterrupted": *ambulo*, rare in poetry owing to its awkward prosody (Ov. [2], Prop. [2]), suggests carefree, aimless wandering; cf. esp. Sen. *Nat.* 7.31.2 *tenero et molli ingressu suspendimus gradum (non ambulamus sed incedimus). ambulo* + accusative of ground covered is very rare; cf. Cic. *Fin.* 2.112 *si Xerxes . . . Hellesponto iuncto, Athone perfosso maria ambulavisset, terram navigavisset* (though some editors read *mari . . . terra*), *Thes.* 1.1876.55ff.; R. Mayer in Adams/Mayer (1999) 162–3. *perpetuus* is elsewhere coupled with *via* to denote an uninterrupted route; cf. Cic. *Pis.* 33 *ut omnes exsecrarentur, male precarentur, unam tibi illam viam et perpetuam esse vellent*, Pan. 2.26.5.

123 sanguine letifero: 'death-bringing blood' is meaningless, as blood is a signal of dying, not the cause. This must be a concise means of expressing 'fatal *outpouring of* blood' (*Thes.* 7.2.1188.57–8); for a similarly concise Ovidian phrase, cf. *Rem.* 26 *sed tua mortifero sanguine tela carent.*

miscebitur: for *misceo* in the sense 'embroil (a system, state of affairs)', cf. Cic. *Agr.* 2.91 *qui . . . iniquis imperiis rem publicam miscerent*, Sal. *Cat.* 10.1, *OLD* s.v. 11c. For the future indicative replacing the more usual present subjunctive in an ideal condition, see 599n.

125 praesideo foribus caeli cum mitibus Horis: Janus makes first specific reference to his primary role as celestial doorkeeper. Apollo was also worshipped in this capacity, as *Thyraios* ('God of the Door'), and for this reason the late Republican scholar Nigidius Figulus closely aligned Janus with Apollo, suggesting that they were one and the same deity; cf. Macr. 1.9.6, 8; for further correlation between Janus and Apollo, see 140n.

The *Horae* are attributed various functions in mythology (see Williams on Verg. *A.* 3.512), but their role as guardians of the gates of Heaven is as old as Homer; cf. *Il.* 5.749ff., 8.393ff. Their role here seems limited to that of Janus' attendants: is the proud Janus exaggerating his powers?; see 89–288 (iii) n.

126 (it, redit officio Iuppiter ipse meo) "Jupiter himself comes and goes thanks to my service": a mock-pompous aside in which Janus highlights the most impressive implication of his liminal duties.

127–30 The sentence in 127–8 is not completed within the confines of the couplet, with the result that one is obliged to run over to the next line (*nomina ridebis* (129)). This is rare for Latin elegy, where

couplets are usually self-contained (with heavy punctuation at the end of the pentameter); for further examples, cf. e.g. 3.705–7 *at quicumque nefas ausi, prohibente deorum/numine, polluerant pontificale caput,/morte iacent merita*, 4.357–9, *Her.* 14.29–31, Platnauer (1951) 27–33.

127 inde vocor Ianus: Janus refers back to *praesideo foribus caeli* (125) and invites us to infer that his name stems from the *ianua* over which he presides; for the popular link, cf. 2.51; Cic. *N.D.* 2.67 *Ianum . . . ex quo transitions perviae iani foresque in liminibus profanarum aedium ianuae nominantur* with Pease ad loc.; Var. *Ant.* fr. 200 Card.; Serv. *A.* 1.449; Johannes Lydus *Mens.* 4.2. As far as Janus is concerned, *he* takes his name from the *ianua*, not the other way round; for the debate over which gave rise to the other, see Frazer on 89; Porte (1985) 228 n. 184.

Given the presence of the verb *ire* in the preceding line (*it* (**D**ς), a less well-attested reading), there is perhaps an allusion to another derivation of *Ianus*, entertained by Cicero, from *eundum* 'going', apparently because the world (associated with Janus) is ever-moving; cf. Cic. *N.D.* 2.27.1 *principem in sacrificando Ianum esse voluerunt, quod ab eundo nomen est ductum*; Macr. 1.9.11 *unde et Cornificius Etymorum libro tertio: "Cicero", inquit, "non Ianum sed Eanum nominat, ab eundo" . . . alii mundum id est caelum esse voluerunt Ianumque ab eundo dictum, quod mundus semper eat*; Porte (1985) 229 n. 185. However, if the allusion is intended at all, it is very faint: Janus can hardly derive his name from an action which *Jupiter* is performing (126).

127–8 Ceriale . . . libum farraque mixta sale: sacrificial cakes and emmer wheat mixed with salt were traditional rustic gifts offered to all deities; see 337–8n., 670n. However, the cake specifically given to Janus on 1st January was known as the *ianual* or *strues*; cf. Fest. 93 L. *ianual: libi genus, quod Iano tantummodo delibatur*; for *strues*, see 276n.

129 nomina ridebis: Janus again shows himself to be a jovial character; see 89–288 (iii) n.

129–30 Patulcius . . . Clusius: these names for Janus, clearly derived from *patere* and *cludere*, are attested (with some variation) in later commentators; cf. Serv. *A.* 7.610 *alii Clusivium (Clusium) dicunt, alii Patulcum (Patulcium), quod patendarum portarum habeat potestatem*; Macr. 1.9.15 *in sacris quoque invocamus . . . Ianum Patultium et Clusivium*; Johannes Lydus *Mens.* 4.1. Although they are usually taken to mean 'he who opens/he who closes', corresponding to Janus' duties mentioned in 118, they may refer instead to the two conditions of his temple [Janus Geminus/Quirinus], meaning 'he who is open/he who is closed' (Porte (1985) 252–3).

130 sacrifico . . . ore "from the mouth of the priest performing the rites": *sacrificus*, first found in Ovid (Bömer on *Met.* 15.483), is transferred here from individual to mouth, a favourite Ovidian ploy; cf. 474 (with n.), 538 *praescia lingua* with n., Sen. *Ag.* 166 *cum stetit ad aras ore sacrifico pater*; for the general poetic practice of transferral of epithet (hypallage), see e.g. Smith on Tib. 1.4.10.

131–2 Janus indulges in a spot of etymological speculation of his own here, though not without irony: his amusingly derogatory reference to antiquity as *rudis illa vetustas* (131) stands at odds with the earlier pride he showed in his own ancient status (103 *sum res prisca* with n.).

132 diversas . . . vices "the alternation of opposite duties" (Paley).

133–44 Janus finally explains the (second) reason for his shape. Having drawn attention to the double-sided nature of a door (135–6) and the function of the human doorkeeper (137–8), Janus derives his own shape and function from these two earthly features: he is a *celestial* version of the earthly doorkeeper (139–40), and his double shape, like the earthly door, is designed to survey inside and outside simultaneously (143–4). As such, Janus offers an explanation for his shape in terms of its suitability for a future function, an interesting variation on the more common 'historical' form of exegesis; see 101–44n. It is particularly ironic that he should derive his nature from the earthly doorkeeper, who was typically considered to be of the lowest status, unfit for other duties; cf. Arist. *Oec.* 1345a; Sen. *Ep.* 12.3 *conversus ad ianuam 'quis est' inquam 'iste decrepitus et merito ad ostium admotus?'*; McKeown's introduction to *Am.* 1.6. This assimilation competes with the more grandiose roles attributed to Janus (see 89–288 (ii) n.) and bears witness, in the god's own words, to the complexity of the deity.

133–4 A partial admittance from Janus that the comments made in 115–32 have been designed as much to boast of the god's power as to answer Ovid's question directly; see 115–16n.

133 vis mea narrata est; causam nunc disce figurae: Janus' response is carefully demarcated, in a manner typical of didactic poetry in general; cf. e.g. 233, 2.685, 4.783 *expositus mos est; moris mihi restat origo*, Hes. *Op.* 106–7, Call. *Aet.* fr. 7.23–4 Pf., Lucr. 1.265–70, Verg. *G.* 1.160, Miller (1983) 166–7; see also 89–288 (iv) n. For the standard didactic imperative *disce*, see 101n.

135 omnis habet geminas . . . ianua frontes "every door has two sides": the choice of language here paves the way to the connection between god and door. First, though *geminus* is often used to denote things which naturally occur in twos (see 370n.), the adjective may also hint at a connection between door and Janus, via his cult name

Geminus. Secondly, the use of *frons* to denote the inner and outer sides of a structure is rare; cf. Vitr. 1.5.3, 3.5.5, Plin. *Nat.* 36.171, *OLD* s.v. 8a, *Thes.* 6.1362.34ff. The most common sense of *frons* is 'forehead': does the phraseology again pre-empt a correlation between the door's 'two sides' and the god's 'two heads'? Furthermore, it is worth noting that the verb *spectat* (136) suits an animate subject better than the (inanimate) door.

136 Larem: a reference to the *Lar familiaris*, the household god that protected the family, which was typically located either in the atrium or near the hearth, sometimes in a box (*lararium*); cf. e.g. Pl. *Aul.* 386, Cato *Ag.* 143, Hor. *Epod.* 2.65ff., Tib. 1.3.34, Prop. 4.3.54; D. Orr (1978), "Roman Domestic Religion: the evidence of the household shrines", *ANRW* 2.16.2, 1563ff. Alternatively, *larem* may be taken here metonymically as 'household'; cf. e.g. 6.95 *et lare communi soceros generosque receptos, Pont.* 1.1.10, Verg. *G.* 3.344, Hor. *Carm.* 1.12.44, Prop. 4.10.18, *Thes.* 7.2.966.47ff.

137 primi . . . tecti "at the entrance of the house": for *primus* in this sense, see *OLD* s.v. 10b.

138 ianitor: reference to Janus specifically by the term *ianitor* might encourage reflection on Ovid's past experiences. For the poet who professes maturation from love elegy (cf. 2.3–8, 4.9–12), it is ironic that he should still find himself conversing with a *ianitor*; for the poet's address to his mistress' doorkeeper (*paraclausithyron*), cf. *Am.* 1.6; see also 277n.

egressus introitusque: equivalent to *egredientes ingredientesque*, this is a distinctly prosaic manner of expression: *egressus* is only found in poetry elsewhere at *Met.* 11.748, *Tr.* 2.189 and Stat. *Theb.* 12.351 (*Thes.* 5.2.295.10ff.); *introitus* is found in earlier poetry only in Lucretius (*Thes.* 7.2.78.16ff.).

139 perspicio, more forceful than *videt* (138), suggests a careful and wide-reaching inspection, and is often used by Ovid of higher beings; cf. e.g. 5.559 (Mars), *Met.* 2.404–5 *terras hominumque labores/perspicit* (Jupiter), 7.226 (Medea), 15.65 (Pythagoras).

caelestis . . . aulae: the phrase is only otherwise found in Christian writers; cf. Hier. *Ep.* 58.3, *Thes.* 2.1456.82ff.

140 Eoas partes Hesperiasque: Varro (*Ant.* fr. 233 Card.), identifying Janus with the universe, likewise attributes the god with the ability to see both East and West: *(simulacrum Iani bifrontis) . . . quia etiam nomine Orientis et Occidentis totus solet mundus intellegi.* The ability to view both East and West is, however, more readily associated with the Sun-god Apollo; cf. e.g. *Met.* 2.190 *prospicit occasus, interdum respicit*

ortus (Phaethon on the Sun's chariot), 4.172, 226–8 *ille ego sum* . . . *omnia qui video, per quem videt omnia tellus*. In articulating his powers in this way, then, Janus hints at the common association made between himself and the Sun; cf. Serv. *A.* 7.607, 610, Johannes Lydus *Mens.* 4.2; see also 125n. For the common opposition *Eous/Hesperius*, cf. *Tr.* 4.9.22, Cinna *carm.* fr. 6 Courtney, *Ciris* 352; H. Dahlmann (1977), *Über Helvius Cinna*, Mainz, 39ff.

141–2 Janus evokes another multi-faced deity, the three-headed Hecate, to explain his function; for Hecate, see 389n. Janus' suggestion that Hecate's many faces are designed to guard the triple crossroads is only one of several views entertained in antiquity; see Pease on Verg. *A.* 4.511, *OCD* s.v. (Hecate is the third member of a trinity of gods; her faces reflect the phases of the moon). As such, Janus is here choosing the interpretation most suitable for his argument. It is also worth noting that, in suggesting a connection between himself and Hecate, Janus mouths the views of contemporary scholars: Nigidius Figulus suggested that Diana and Janus might be one and the same deity (Macr. 1.9.8).

141 in tres vertentia partes "facing in three directions": according to *OLD* s.v. 10b, this is the only example of the present participle of *verto* used intransitively to mean 'facing'; for the more common expression, *versus*, cf. e.g. Liv. 1.41.4 *per fenestras in Novam viam versas* . . . *populum Tanaquil adloquitur*, *Met.* 13.725, Plin. *Nat.* 3.92.

142 in ternas . . . vias "into three roads": the phrase alludes to Hecate's cult name Trivia, in her capacity as protector of crossroads; see 389n.

143–4 In suggesting that his form saves him from wasting time in turning round, Janus again offers an amusing and unparalleled explanation for his shape; see 113–14n. However, one can argue for a more serious interpretation here: not only is it extremely important for the god of the year not to be 'losing time'; as *tempora* may have been a short-title for the poem (see 1–2 (iv) n.), Janus' form can be read as crucial for the very 'existence' of the poem; for similar play on *tempora*, cf. 6.771 with Barchiesi (1997) 263.

143 tempora perdam: for the idiom, cf. e.g. Cic. *Orat.* 3.146, *Ars* 1.504, *Met.* 11.286, *Tr.* 2.484, *Thes.* 10.1.1267.66ff.; see also 143–4n.

144 bina "two directions": the neuter substantive is rare, and takes its sense from the context; cf. e.g. Var. *L.* 8.76 *in aliis verbis nihil deest, ut dulcis dulcior dulcissimus* . . . *in aliis bina sunt quae desint* (two forms), Lucr. 1.533 (two parts), *Thes.* 2.1997.11ff.

146 difficilem "unfavourably disposed": for *difficilis* in the sense of

a powerful being's unwillingness to grant an audience to its inferiors, cf. e.g. *Ars* 2.565–6 *nec Venus oranti . . . / rustica Gradivo difficilisque fuit, Met.* 9.284, *Pont.* 1.6.47 (Augustus), 2.2.20 (Messalinus), *Thes.* 5.1.1087.54ff. In Roman prayer, mortals typically ask a deity to be *facilis*; cf. 2.451 *parce, precor, gravidis, facilis Lucina, puellis* (Juno), *Am.* 2.14.43, *anth.* I.877.3.

pactus erat (**Aω**) "he agreed": the reading is preferable to *fassus erat* (**UMς**) on the grounds that Ovid gives considerable emphasis to peace in this book, and regularly employs unusual derivations from *pax*; see 3n.

147–8 Ovid has now been reassured by the benign god; his recovery of a calmer disposition picks up on his earlier frightened state (97–8).

147 sumpsi animum "I took courage": for the idiom, cf. *Rem.* 518 *sume animos, Met.* 3.544–5, Sen. *Con.* 10.1.6, Stat. *Silv.* 4.4.55, *Thes.* 2.103.6ff.

gratesque deo . . . egi: the formula *grates ago* is especially common in addresses to deities; cf. e.g. *Met.* 6.435 *disque ipsi grates egere,* 10.291, 14.596, *Pont.* 4.9.31, Pl. *Merc.* 843, Cic. *Rep.* 6.9, *Thes.* 6.2.2204.16ff.

148 spectans . . . humum: the Romans considered it unlawful to look upon deities without their permission; cf. 3.372, 6.7–8, Liv. 1.16.6 *cum perfusus horrore venerabundus adstitissem, petens precibus ut contra intueri fas esset* (Proculus to Quirinus) with Ogilvie ad loc., Sen. *Ep.* 115.4, *Nat.* 7.30.1. However, Ovid's reaction may also be attributed in part to his (natural) unease about looking upon a two-faced deity.

pauca: though this is the reading of all the MSS, many argue for *plura* on the grounds of an alleged contradiction in the text: Ovid's forthcoming address to Janus is described here as *verba . . . pauca* (148) but later as *multis* (161). It is typically argued that some post-exilic insertion has taken place here: the original question was merely 149–50 (*dic, age . . . incipiendus erat?*) and that, accordingly, the original 151 (161 in our text) read *quaesieram paucis*; in adding extra material at a later date, Ovid changed *paucis* in 161 to *multis*, but overlooked *pauca* in 148; for arguments along these lines, see E. Alton (1918), *CR* 32, 13–14; G. Kowalski (1930), *Gnomon* 6, 222; Bömer (1957) 18; Schilling (1992) ad loc. I suggest that no post-exilic insertion has occurred in this section (see 149–60n.) and that *pauca* fits well in the existing context. The point is that *pauca* need not indicate a short speech; cf. esp. Verg. *A.* 4.333 *tandem pauca refert* (Aeneas' 29–line speech to Dido), also Pl. *Men.* 6 *verba . . . paucissuma,* Verg. *A.* 2.11 *breviter* (Aeneas' 'brief' recollection spans two books). The most convincing explanation

of the Vergilian *pauca* is a focalised interpretation: *pauca* represents Aeneas' viewpoint, that whatever he says will be insufficient after Dido's speech; see D. Feeney (1983), "The Taciturnity of Aeneas", *CQ* 33, 205. A similarly focalised interpretation fits Ovid's usage here: *pauca* represents the poet's viewpoint, in that he gives only a few examples to bolster his case that the New Year should begin in spring (see 149–60n.), though it is apparent that he could have said more. As a separate issue, *multis* (161) is to be understood principally with the juxtaposed *non multis* (161), highlighting the comparative lengths of the utterances of both parties.

149–60 In his first direct question to Janus as interviewer, Ovid asks why it is that the New Year begins in winter when it ought, in the poet's opinion, to begin in spring (149–50); he then proceeds to explain in some detail why he believes this should be so (151–60). His argument is carefully structured and rhetorically powerful. First, he produces an impressive catalogue of images to illustrate spring's intrinsic connection with newness and beginnings: this is the time of life renewal (151 *nova*), the new bud (152 *nova*), the new foliage (153), the new shoot (154), the new herd (156), the first sight of the swallow (157) and renewed ploughing (159 *renovatur*). Secondly, Ovid adopts a polysyndetic style (*et* [152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 158, 159], *-que* [157]) and employs repetition of *tunc* (151) and *tum* (157, 159) to help create the impression that there is such an overwhelming amount of accessible material to support his argument. In effect, this section amounts to a praise of spring, which was a well-established rhetorical exercise practised elsewhere by Ovid; for other examples of the *laus veris*, cf. 3.235–42, 4.125–8, *Tr.* 3.12.1–26, Verg. *G.* 2.323–35, Calp. *Ecl.* 5.16ff., *anth.* I.1.227.

In the context of the poem as a whole, this first speech from the poet-interviewer is striking for two reasons. First, it is by far the longest utterance. On all further occasions during the conversation with Janus, Ovid's questions are brief (at most two verses), which gives Janus the spotlight to respond; cf. 171–2, 175–6, 185–6, 189–90, 229–30, 257–8, 277. In fact, throughout the poem, Ovid's next longest question is four verses (cf. e.g. 5.355–8). Secondly, on all other occasions, Ovid's questions take the form of an enquiry in which no direct opinion is expressed. Here however, Ovid has his own strong viewpoint (expressed by insistent gerundives *incipiendus* (150) and *vocanda* (160)) and sets out his case as a direct challenge to what actually occurs. Ovid may have borrowed this tactic from

Callimachus' *Aetia*. In a similar fashion, during a conversation with Clio, the poet-interviewer asks why Zancle does not name its founder on festal days, and then gives a long list of cities that name their founder to justify his surprise; cf. Call. *Aet.* fr. 43.46–56 Pf.

Given the uniqueness of this utterance in Ovid, many have viewed at least some of these lines as later insertions from the poet, and this has been further encouraged by an alleged contradiction in the existing text (for which, see 148n.). However, no convincing views have been put forward as to why Ovid should have chosen to add (extraneous) detail at a later stage. The whole issue of revision is misleading here: we need to ask what purpose these lines serve in the given context.

I suggest that this involved utterance marks the initial stage in the characterization of the poet in his role as interviewer. By arguing for the New Year's beginning in another month, Ovid effectively attempts to cheat Janus out of one of his primary roles as opener of the year; besides, he should already know that Janus is the opener of all things, because Janus tells him so in lines 117–18. Ovid can therefore be seen as somewhat tactless and naïve in his early dealings with Janus: this is the starting-point from which progress can be charted; see Green (2001).

149 dic, age: though colloquial, this is a popular way of opening a formal address to a higher being; cf. e.g. *Am.* 3.5.31 (Ovid to the augur), *Met.* 12.177 (Achilles to Nestor), Hor. *Carm.* 3.4.1 (Calliope). It suggests urgency on the part of the speaker, and so is particularly appropriate for an eager interviewer; cf. 5.277 *dic, dea* (Flora), Call. *Aet.* fr. 76 Pf. εἴπ' ἄγε μοι (Zeus).

frigoribus "the cold season, winter": a poetic usage; cf. e.g. *Tr.* 5.10.1, *Pont.* 1.3.37, Verg. *Ecl.* 10.65, *G.* 1.48, Hor. *Carm.* 4.7.9, *Thes.* 6.1.1335.30ff.

150 incipiendus erat: the pluperfect suggests that Ovid is speaking from within the time-frame of the poem: the year has *already* begun; for simultaneity between poem and year elsewhere in Book 1, see 2n.

151 omnia tunc florent: Ovid echoes the words of his own Pythagoras at *Met.* 15.204, who likewise implies that the New Year begins in spring, from which he can start to make his analogy between the seasons and the stages of human life (*Met.* 15.199ff.); for the relative chronology of *Met.* and *Fasti*, see Introduction, II. Quoting Pythagoras (intertextually) lends a certain credibility to Ovid's argument.

tunc est nova temporis aetas "then is the new period of time": this notion is explored more fully by Pythagoras at *Met.* 15.199ff. (see previous n.).

152 et nova de gravido palmite gemma tumet "and the new bud swells from the heavy vine-shoot": this image of spring is an Ovidian favourite; cf. 3.238 *uvidaque in tenero palmite gemma tumet*, 4.128 *nunc tumido gemmas cortice palmes agit*, also *Tr.* 3.12.13–14 (no such images in spring at Tomis).

153 et modo formatis operitur frondibus arbor "and the tree covers itself with leaves newly-formed": *operitur frondibus* (**AU**ω) may be preferable to *amicitur vitibus* (**M**ς) on stylistic grounds: Ovid's argument is stronger if he introduces new ideas to bolster his case, rather than reiterating the point about vines made in 152. For the middle sense of *operio*, cf. *Rem.* 196 *peregrinis arbor operta comis*, Plin. *Nat.* 9.160 *[pisces] quae vero siliceo tegmine operiuntur.*

154 seminis herba "the shoot from the seed": *herba* regularly denotes the first shoot that emerges from the ground; cf. e.g. 3.239–40 *quaeque diu latuit . . . /fertilis occultas invenit herba vias*, 4.127 *nunc herbae rupta tellure cacumina tollunt*, *Tr.* 3.12.11–12, Plin. *Nat.* 18.51, *Thes.* 6.3.2623.10ff. It often refers to corn (*Thes.* 6.3.2622.57ff.), but the sentiment may be more general here.

155 et tepidum volucres concentibus aera mulcent "and the birds soothe the warm air with their musical strains": a distinctly poetic sentiment with Vergilian overtones; cf. Verg. *G.* 1.422 *hinc ille avium concentus in agris*, *A.* 7.33–4 *volucres . . . aethera mulcebant cantu*, also Dracontius *Romulea* 7.96–9; for birdsong as a classic sign of spring, cf. *Tr.* 3.12.8 *indocilique loquax gutture vernat avis. concentus* is regularly used to describe the songs of birds; cf. e.g. Cic. *Leg.* 1.21, Sen. *Dial.* 6.18.4, *Thes.* 4.20.17ff.

156 ludit et in pratis luxuriatque pecus "and the herd plays and frolics in the meadows": this refers not to adult animals ready to mate, but to their young offspring, recently born, who are enjoying themselves in the open for the first time; for the standard practice of breeding animals in June/July so that calving takes place in early spring, cf. Col. 6.24, White (1970) 286. The use of *luxurio* to refer to the sporting of animals is rare; cf. Verg. *G.* 3.81, *A.* 11.497, Col. 7.3.18, *Thes.* 7.2.1927.71ff.

157 blandi soles: *blandus* is regularly used of the 'charms' of the natural world, cf. e.g. *Her.* 13.134 *blandaque conpositas aura secundet aquas*, *Met.* 4.344, Verg. *Ecl.* 4.23, Plin. *Nat.* 2.79, *Thes.* 2.2039.46ff.

157–8 ignotaque prodit hirundo/et luteum celsa sub trabe figit opus "and the stranger swallow comes forth and composes its muddy structure under a high beam": the swallow is specified among the other birds (155) because it is traditionally recognised as the

herald of spring; cf. 2.853 *veris praenuntia venit hirundo,* Hes. *Op.* 568–9, Hor. *Carm.* 4.12.5–6, *Ep.* 1.7.12–13, Sauvage (1975) 210. It is elsewhere reputed to build its nest under the beam of a building; cf. *Tr.* 3.12.9–10 *hirundo/sub trabibus cunas tectaque parva facit,* Hom. *Od.* 22.239–40, Verg. *G.* 4.306–7 *ante/garrula quam tignis nidum suspendat hirundo,* Sauvage (1975) 208–9.

157 ignotaque: the primary sense of *ignotus* is *peregrinus* (*Thes.* 7.1.320.35). As such, it is an appropriate term to describe the swallow returning from abroad.

158 luteum: usually 'muddy', this is the first occurrence of the adjective in the sense 'made of mud'; cf. Plin. *Nat.* 7.194, *Thes.* 7.2.1894.47ff.

159 renovatur aratro "[the land] is renewed by ploughing": this is a favourite Ovidian idiom for ploughing; cf. *Am.* 1.3.9 *nec meus innumeris renovatur campus aratris, Met.* 1.110, 15.125, *Tr.* 4.6.13, 5.12.23, Lygd. 3.5. The idiom is particularly appropriate in this section, where Ovid is keen to stress spring's connection with newness; see 149–60n.

161 multis: for the alleged contradiction with *pauca* (148), see 148n.

162 contulit in versus sic sua verba duos "he put his own words briefly into two verses like so": the phraseology suggests that Janus fashions his response in the form of an elegiac couplet. This is the clearest correlation between Janus and the poem itself; see 89–288 (iv) n. A similarly close correlation between poem and internal speaker occurs with Propertius' Vertumnus, who, aware of how many verses remain in his poem, realises that he needs to finish speaking; cf. Prop. 4.2.57–8 *sex superant versus: te, qui ad vadimonia curris,/non moror*; for the connections between Vertumnus and Janus, see 89–288 (ii), (iv) n. *confero* is regularly used to denote speaking in concise fashion, cf. e.g. Pl. *As.* 88, *Men.* 6. *quam potero in verba conferam paucissima,* Cic. *Caec.* 17, Suet. *Caes.* 44.

163 bruma novi prima est veterisque novissima solis "the winter solstice marks the first of the new sun and the last of the old one": Janus adopts the popular but erroneous view that the sun begins a new course after the winter and summer solstices; cf. Var. *L.* 6.8 *alter motus solis est . . . quod movetur a bruma ad solstitium,* Cic. *N.D.* 2.19, Cens. 21.13, *Thes.* 2.2207.9ff. In the process, Janus cleverly turns the poet's own tactics against him by employing forms of *novus,* just as Ovid had done in his previous argument (149–60).

bruma: used here in its strict sense of the shortest day of the year, the winter solstice; cf. Var. *L.* 6.8 *dicta bruma, quod brevissimus tunc dies est,* Vitr. 9.3.3, Serv. *A.* 2.472, Maltby 85 s.v.

novissima "final": for the sense, cf. Liv. 3.33.6, Tac. *Ger.* 24.2 *extremo ac novissimo iactu de libertate ac de corpore contendant, OLD* s.v. *novissimus* 2a.

164 principium capiunt Phoebus et annus idem: strictly speaking, the winter solstice was reckoned by the ancients to occur round about 25th December (Col. 9.14.12, Plin. *Nat.* 18.221), that is, a few days before the New Year on 1st January. Nevertheless, as Janus suggests here, the two events were commonly tacked together as occurring 'at the same time'; cf. Var. *L.* 6.8 *tempus a bruma ad brumam dum sol redit, vocatur annus,* Plu. *Mor.* 268d, Cens. 21.13 *a novo sole, id est a bruma . . . incipere annus naturalis videtur, Thes.* 2.2207.33ff.

165 mirabar: Ovid, in his role as earnest researcher/interviewer, regularly reveals his fascination and keenness to learn more; cf. 171 with n., 183–4, 190, 5.275 *talia dicentem tacitus mirabar,* Miller (1983) 172 n. 2. This is also a discernible feature of the researcher/interviewer in Callimachus' *Aetia*; cf. fr. 43.84–5 Pf. ὣς ἡ μὲν λίπε μῦθον, ἐγὼ δ' ἐπὶ καὶ [τὸ πυ]θέσθαι/ἤθελον-ἦ γάρ μοι θάμβος ὑπετρέφετο, also fr. 31B Pf.

165–6 cur non sine litibus esset/prima dies: *prima dies* is suitably delayed for shock effect—in the context of the poem, we have been led to believe from Ovid's earlier proclamation at 73–4 (*lite vacent aures, insanaque protinus absint/iurgia*) that the first day was *exempt* from lawsuits.

167–70 Janus explains that only enough business is conducted to satisfy the omen for the New Year. For the sake of this omen, it was customary for the consuls to carry out various acts of allegiance (to the Emperor) and for the tribunes to meet to consider petitions without coming to any decisions; cf. Johannes Lydus *Mens.* 4.4. Any attempt to bring important or lengthy lawsuits on this day was, however, met with disapproval; cf. e.g. Tac. *Ann.* 4.36, Suet. *Nero* 7.2 *auspicatus est et iuris dictionem praefectus urbi sacro Latinarum, celeberrimis patronis non tralaticias, ut assolet, et brevis, sed maximas plurimasque postulationes certatim ingerentibus.*

167 nascentia: for *nascor* in the sense 'to have its beginnings', cf. Cic. *Prov.* 37, Liv. 34. 6.7, Verg. *A.* 7.44, *OLD* s.v. 11.

168 Janus makes first mention of the presiding omen, namely that what occurs on the first day is crucial for the entire year. But Ovid fails to take in its full implications and forces Janus to repeat himself; cf. 175–180, 187–8, Green (2001).

169–70 "For the same reason, each person gives a taste of his own occupation, and does no more than afford evidence of his usual

employment": a good example of this practice comes from the sphere of agriculture, whereby Roman husbandmen would make a point of partaking of each type of rural labour on 1st January purely for the sake of the omen; cf. Col. 11.2.98, Meslin (1970) 37–8.

169 ob idem: Ovid is keen on idioms involving the substantive *idem*, which take their meaning from the context; see 395n. Here, it must signify *ob eandem causam.*

delibat: literally 'taste', the metaphorical usage is less common; cf. Cic. *Sen.* 78 with Powell ad loc., Liv. 5.12.12 *nec satis constat cur primus ac potissimus ad novum delibandum honorem sit habitus*, Plin. *Pan.* 54.3, *Thes.* 5.1.441.46ff.

171–2 As Ovid's question implies, it was recognised practice to invoke Janus first in prayers; cf. Cic. *N.D.* 2.67 *principem in sacrificando Ianum esse voluerunt* with Pease ad loc., Var. *Ant.* fr. 236 Card., Macr. 1.9.9, Serv. *A.* 7.610, Holland (1961) 283–5; for Janus called first in extant prayers, cf. Cato *Agr.* 134.2, Liv. 8.9.6, Appel (1909) 88.

171 mox ego: the omission of the verb of saying after direct speech is common in poetry; cf. e.g. 3.171, *Her.* 10.37, *Am.* 2.5.33–4 with McKeown ad loc., *Rem.* 39, Verg. *A.* 3.99. Here, the ellipse might serve to heighten the sense of eagerness on the speaker's part; see 165n.

172 tura merumque: incense and wine are the standard offerings to all gods; cf. e.g. 4.935–6 (Robigo), *Her.* 21.94, *Ars* 1.638, *Met.* 13.636, *Pont.* 3.1.162. Ovid is quite precise here, as *merum*, wine unmixed with water, is the proper form for sacrifice; cf. Plin. *Nat.* 14.119, Fest. 474 L. s.v. '*spurcum vinum*'. For the different types of incense, see 341ff.

173–4 Janus explains the custom of invoking him first in prayer in terms of a slight extension to his duties as celestial doorkeeper: not only does he regulate the movements of the gods (125–6), but he opens the door between divine and mortal; cf. Macr. 1.9.9 *invocarique primum . . . ut per eum pateat ad illum cui immolatur accessus, quasi preces supplicium per portas suas ad deos ipse transmittat.* However, the ancients entertained other reasons for the practice; cf. Fest. 45 L. s.v. '*Chaos*', [Aur. Vict.] *Orig.* 3.7 (Janus is invoked first through seniority, as he is the god of gods or father of the gods), Serv. *A.* 7.610 (Janus is associated with the air, so all sound must pass through him). It is interesting (and amusing), therefore, that Janus should shun grander explanations—in terms of his seniority, prestige or

power over beginnings—and explain the practice in terms of his lowly role as doorkeeper (see also 133–44n.).

175–6 Ovid here wishes to know the reason behind a practice which he had earlier taken for granted; cf. 72 *nunc dicenda bona sunt bona verba die.* For the standard practice of offering good wishes on the first day of the year, see 63–4n.

176 preces "good wishes": the only true example of the use of *prex* to denote mutual good wishes, in which there is no sense of petition from an inferior to a superior party: the two parallels offered by *Thes.* 10.2.1220.55ff. (*Met.* 7.451, Liv. 27.45.7) still involve a sense of hierarchy between leader and subjects.

177 tum deus incumbens baculo: detailing the god's mannerisms is an effective way of enlivening the account of such meetings between poet and informant; cf. 254 *clavem ostendens,* 259 *ille, manu mulcens propexam ad pectora barbam,* 5.194, 359–60 (Flora); for the specific detail of the 'leaning deity' during a theophany, cf. Call. *Aet.* fr. 43.56–7 Pf. Κλειὼ δὲ τὸ [δ]εύτερον ἤρχ[ετο μ]ύθ[ου]/χεῖρ' ἐπ' ἀδελφειῆς ὦμον ἐρεισαμένη, Prop. 3.3.13–14 *cum me Castalia speculans ex arbore Phoebus/sic ait aurata nixus ad antra lyra.* For the significance of Janus' staff, see 99n.

178 omina principiis . . . inesse solent "omens are usually associated with beginnings": Janus spells out what was merely implied in 168 (see n.). The Romans held this omen in high regard in all areas of life. For example, it was traditional for soldiers with lucky names to be called first in a levy of troops, to be named first on the census roll and to lead the victim in a sacrifice (see Cic. *Div.* 1.102 with Pease ad loc.). The first vote to be cast in the Comitia—the *praerogativa*—was considered particularly important in predicting the final verdict (cf. Cic. *Mur.* 38, *Planc.* 49). More generally, if a journey started with some type of mishap, usually a stumble (*pedis offensio*), it was considered ill-omened; cf. *Am.* 1.12.3–6 with McKeown ad loc., *Met.* 9.595–7, Tib. 1.3.19–20. In literature too, writers were conscious of the need to start their works with good omens (cf. Liv. *Praef.* 13).

inesse: for *insum* in the sense 'to be associated with', cf. e.g. Pl. *Capt.* 250, Cic. *Ver.* 3.165, Sal. *Hist.* 2.47.14 *multa cura summo imperio inest,* Stat. *Theb.* 3.137, *OLD* s.v. 4.

179 ad primam vocem timidas advertitis aures: for the importance of the first name called/heard, see 178n. A more unusual example is given by Pausanius (7.22.2–3) whereby, on consulting the

image of Hermes, a suppliant covers his ears until he leaves the market and considers the first words he hears thereafter to be oracular. For the idiom *adverto aures* 'I give ear to', cf. Prop. 1.1.37, Man. 3.37, Tac. *Ann.* 1.41, *Thes.* 2.1510.59ff.

180 et visam primum consulit augur avem "the augur observes the bird that he has seen first": a contentious remark. The first sight for the augur is important, but it does not necessary determine the outcome. There are examples of occasions on which it is the best sign, rather than the first, which proves decisive (cf. Serv. *A.* 3.374). The most famous example is the foundation contest between Romulus and Remus, where it is the number of birds seen, rather than the timing, which proves crucial; cf. Liv. 1.7.1, Dion. Hal. 1.86. Interestingly however, in *Fasti*, Ovid is self-consistent with this statement: in his version of the Romulus and Remus story, it is Romulus who receives the *first* signs (5.151–2).

consulit: the technical verb for the observing of divine signs; see *Thes.* 4.582.30ff.

augur avem: the juxtaposition suggests etymological play; for the common derivation of *augur* from *avis*, cf. Fest. 2 L. *augur ab avibus gerendoque dictus*; see also 611n.

181 templa patent auresque deum "(sc. on the first day) the temples and ears of the gods are open": for the syllepsis, a favourite Ovidian technique, see 597n.

181–2 nec lingua caducas/concipit ulla preces, dictaque pondus habent "nor does any tongue utter ineffectual prayers, and words have weight": there is an interesting mix of metaphor here, which is perhaps appropriate coming from a 'two-faced' deity. *caducus*, literally 'falling', is used metaphorically to promote the idea that prayers will not fall to the ground today, but will reach their divine recipients; for the metaphorical usage, cf. e.g. [Ov.] *Ep. Sapph.* 208, *Met.* 9.597 *fecit spes nostras cera caducas, Pont.* 4.8.46, *Ib.* 86, *Thes.* 3.35.64ff. In the second part of the sentence, however, a contrasting metaphor is developed: that words will have weight today, promoting the idea that they will not be blown away by the breeze; for the idiom *pondus habere* used metaphorically, cf. *Am.* 2.7.14, *Ars* 3.806, *Rem.* 688, *Met.* 9.496, Cic. *Fam.* 13.17.3, Prop. 3.7.43–4 *si . . . verbaque duxisset pondus habere mea*, 4.7.88, Sen. *Dial.* 11.14.2; for futile words blown away in the wind, cf. e.g. *Am.* 2.16.45, Cat 64.59, 70.4, Prop. 2.28.8, Tib. 1.4.21, *Thes.* 7.2.433.42ff. According to Janus, then, words today will be both weighty and lightweight, they will fall and not fall.

182 concipit: the regular verb for solemn religious utterance/prayer; cf. e.g. *Am.* 3.7.44, *Met.* 10.290, *Tr.* 3.13.18, Cato *Agr.* 139 *porco piaculo facito, sic verba concipito*, *OLD* s.v. 12, *Thes.* 4.55.42ff.

183–4 The fact that Ovid wastes no time in asking another question as soon as his informant has finished speaking is indicative of his eagerness as earnest researcher; cf. 4.215–16 *desierat; coepi: "cur huic genus acre leonum/praebent insolitas ad iuga curva iubas?"* (Ovid to Erato); see also 165n.

184 tetigi verbis ultima verba meis: the word order mirrors the sense: *verbis . . . meis* is literally touching *ultima verba.*

185–6 quid volt palma sibi rugosaque carica . . ./et data sub niveo candida mella cado?: it was customary on 1st January for gifts (known formally as *strenae* [Fest. 411 L.]) to be offered publicly to the Emperor and exchanged privately amongst friends and family; for detailed analyses, see Meslin (1970) 31–4, 39–46; D. Baudy (1987), "*Strenarum Commercium*", *RhM* 130, 1–28.

The three gifts mentioned here are distinctly modest offerings which would have been exchanged privately; see Meslin (1970) 42. The *palma,* a date wrapped in gold-coloured paper, was a popular cheap offering; cf. Mart. 8.33.11–12, 13.27.1–2, André (1981) 83. The *carica,* a fig which takes its name from its place of origin (Caria), was imported into Rome cheaply in large quantities and could therefore make a suitable (modest) offering; cf. Col. 12.15.3–4, André (1981) 87. Honey, though not exclusively associated with the poor, was readily available and provided a cheap dessert for peasants; cf. 4.545–6, André (1981) 187–8. The simplicity of all three foodstuffs is further evidenced from the story of the impoverished couple, Baucis and Philemon, who offer their divine guests all of the above; cf. *Met.* 8.674 *hic mixta est rugosis carica palmis,* 677 *candidus in medio favus est.* The simplicity of the offerings here will make a telling contrast with the gifts of cash mentioned later in 189ff.

185 volt: for *volo* in the secondary sense 'mean, signify' (lit: 'want for itself [as its meaning]'), cf. e.g. 6.350, *Met.* 9.474 *tacitae quid vult sibi noctis imago?,* Pl. *Mer.* 254, Ter. *Heaut.* 616, Cic. *Ver.* 2.2.61, Hor. *Carm.* 3.8.2, *OLD* s.v. 17.

rugosaque: literally 'wrinkly', *rugosus* is a common means of referring to dried fruit or vegetables; cf. *Met.* 8.674 (date), Col. 12.44.4 (grape), Pers. 5.55 (pepper), Mart. 13.28.1 (prune).

186 sub niveo . . . cado: the white terracotta jar was used most commonly as a wine-carrier, but it is elsewhere acknowledged as a suitable vessel for honey; cf. Mart. 1.55.10 *flavaque de rubro promere*

mella cado. The dictionaries can offer no parallel for *sub* meaning 'inside' in the strictest sense: the examples given by *OLD* (s.v. 1c) could equally well be translated 'under'; Lewis/Short does not recognize 'inside' as a meaning for *sub.*

candida [U?, YMς] mella: the reading *condita* **[Aω]** ('stored') is well-attested and would be entirely Ovidian; cf. 3.752 *atque avide trunco condita mella petit,* 5.518 *fumoso condita vina cado.* However, the reading *candida,* a standard epithet for honey—cf. *Met.* 8.677, Plin. *Nat.* 11.38, Cels. 5.26.20b—may be preferable on the grounds that the juxtaposing of colour terms (*niveo candida*) is a standard poetic technique; for the juxtaposition of *candidus* and *niveus,* often with no difference in meaning, cf. e.g. Tib. 2.5.38 *caseus et niveae candidus agnus ovis,* Sen. *Apoc.* 4.1.5, André (1949) 39; for the poetic juxtaposition of colour terms in general, see André (1949) 345ff.

187–8 Janus attributes the meaning of the practice to the omen of beginnings highlighted in 177–82.

187 ut res sapor ille sequatur "so that the flavour itself may attend the circumstances".

188 dulcis: the primary sense of *dulcis* is 'sweet to the taste'; cf. e.g. Cato *Agr.* 157.1, Tib. 1.7.54, Prop. 4.2.15, *Thes.* 5.1.2188.22ff. But it may also be taken in the transferred sense 'agreeable, delightful'; cf. e.g. Pl. *Poen.* 968, Verg. *G.* 1.342, Hor. *Carm.* 4.12.28, *Thes.* 5.1.2190.32ff. As such, it is the most suitable adjective to make the desired connection between sweet food and an agreeable year. This double meaning will be used to ironic effect later at 191–2.

189–90 The deliberate demarcation here between previous and forthcoming questions, and the poet's expressed desire to know everything, enhance the didactic nature of this section; for careful demarcation as a feature of didactic poetry, see 133n.; for the eagerness of the poet, see 165n. The earnestness of Ovid's remarks here contrast with the lighthearted and teasing nature of Janus' response in 191–2.

189 stipis: this was a coin, an *as* (Var. *L.* 5.182), which was offered on 1st January along with the edible gifts, often to persons of higher standing than oneself, as a symbol of financial prosperity for the year; cf. Suet. *Aug.* 57.1, *Cal.* 42 (gift to the Emperor), Mart. 8.33.11–12 *hoc linitur sputo Iani caryota Kalendis,/quam fert cum parco sordidus asse cliens* (client to patron), Meslin (1970) 43–4.

190 "so that no part of your festival may escape my understanding".

de: for the partitive usage, see Bömer on 3.732, *OLD* s.v. 10.

festo: *festum,* the substantive of *festus* and an abbreviated form of

dies festus, is Ovid's favourite way of referring to a festival (used 37 times); cf. e.g. 2.513, 3.170, *Am.* 3.13.3, *Ars* 1.416, *Met.* 5.3, *Pont.* 2.1.10, *Thes.* 6.1.631.65ff.

labet: *labo* literally means 'totter, be unsteady' and can be used metaphorically to mean 'be undecided'. But its usage here, to describe the 'tottering' or 'unsteadiness' of a person's understanding if information is lacking, is apparently unique and defies literal translation (*Thes.* 7.2.778.58–9).

191–2 "He smiled and said, 'O how your age deceives you if you think that honey is sweeter than cash in hand'": this serves as an introduction to the forthcoming moral diatribe (193–226) and highlights both the jovial nature of the speaker and the apparent 'naivety' of the questioner (for which, see 89–288 (iii) n.). For the play on the different meanings of *dulcis*, see 188n. At this point, Janus sees himself as detached from the modern age—this is the *poet's* era (191 *tua saecula*); for the surprising change later, see 225n.

193–226 Janus embarks upon a lengthy comparison between early Rome and its modern day counterpart; the focus lies particularly on the moral degeneracy to which Rome has succumbed. After setting temporal parameters for the speech (193–6), Janus proceeds to highlight the morality of early Rome, with occasional comparison with its modern day counterpart (197–208). He then marks a turning point (209–10), after which Rome degenerates gradually until the present day (211–18). After a sudden realisation that he has been digressing from Ovid's original question (219–20), Janus concludes with the conciliatory remark that the gods enjoy the gift of coins because they embrace elements from both past and present (221–6).

Comparisons between early Rome and its modern day counterpart, often involving important landmarks (here, the Capitol (203–4)), are common in Augustan literature, and Ovid draws on these in both general motif and specific detail; for such comparisons, cf. Verg. *A.* 8.97–368, Tib. 2.5.25–38, 55–60, Prop. 4.1.1–30, 4.2.1–10, 4.4.1–14, 4.9; for other examples in *Fasti*, cf. 243ff., 2.279–80, 391ff., 3.179ff., 5.93ff., 6.261ff., 401ff. However, the comparisons found in Vergil, Tibullus and Propertius arguably attempt to marry the elements of both past and present: Augustan Rome is viewed as a synthesis of modern wealth and splendour with primitive, old-fashioned values. In expressing this synthesis, the poets were playing to a key element of Augustan discourse; see esp. White (1993) 189, Edwards (1996) 10–15, 27–43.

However, Janus' comparison here offers no such synthesis or play to Augustan discourse: for the most part, early Rome is seen as encapsulating all the good qualities of mankind, whereas modern Rome represents ultimate degeneration. As such, Janus' speech feels more like the pessimistic diatribes on contemporary moral degeneracy of earlier (late Republican) commentators; cf. esp. Var. *Vit. Pop. Rom.* fr. 121–3 Rip.; Sal. *Cat.* 5ff.; Liv. *Praef.* 9ff., 34.4 (Cato); Hor. *Carm.* 2.15, 3.6; Ovid may have been particularly influenced by Varro's antiquarian works, in which past and present Rome appear to have been regularly juxtaposed to the detriment of the latter; cf. *Vit. Pop. Rom.* fr. 13, 15 Rip., August. *C.D.* 4.31, White (1993) 184–5. In effect, Janus' speech exposes the (ineluctable) tension in Augustan discourse between, on the one hand, a legitimate pride in the splendour of contemporary Rome and, on the other, a respect for the simple values of the primitive city (which carries with it a notion of *degeneration* though time); for a different type of Ovidian 'divorce' between the early and modern Rome (praise for the present and contempt for the past), cf. *Ars* 3.113ff. with Gibson ad loc. Janus' final reconciliatory attempt at harmony between past and present (223–6) does little to alleviate the tensions raised by his earlier comments.

The severity of the sentiments might, however, be mitigated if we take into account the subjectivity of the primary speaker. Janus has previously shown himself to be a character prone to exaggeration and pride in the past (see 89–288 (iii) n.). This section reinforces that characterisation. The images which Janus evokes in his praise of the past and condemnation of the present are entirely clichéd by Ovid's day (see nn.). The sense that we are listening to a diatribe is reinforced in lines 219–20, when Janus admits that he has been ranting off the point and pulls himself back to the question at hand. In reminiscing fondly on the past, Janus lives up to one of the stereotypical characteristics of the 'old man'; cf. e.g. Arist. *Rhet.* 2.13.12, Tib. 1.10.43–4 *sic ego sim, liceatque caput candescere canis,/ temporis et prisci facta referre senem*, Lygd. 5.26, Hor. *Ars* 173; for famous nostalgic old men, cf. Homer's Nestor, Cato in Cic. *Sen.* (*passim*), Tiber in Ov. *Fast.* 5.635–62 [Rutledge (1980)]. Moreover, Janus indulges in frequent exaggeration in this section, often indicated by his (tentative) use of *vix*; see 193–4n., 195–6n., 201n., 210n.

Given the speaker's (natural) bias towards the past, and the hackneyed nature of the diatribe, one might be justified in downplaying Janus' remarks as the stereotypical rant of an aged individual.

Nevertheless, no favourable reading of Janus' speech can fully alleviate the tensions in Augustan discourse which have been exposed.

193–4 "Scarcely did I see anyone during Saturn's reign to whose heart profit was not sweet": a startling statement. The Golden Age, in which Saturn presided in heaven, is traditionally depicted as an era free from the pursuits of wealth: man was content with the gifts that the earth bestowed naturally (cf. Hes. *Op.* 116ff., Verg. *G.* 1.127–8, *Met.* 1.101–6) and had no desire to seek foreign delights (cf. *Am.* 3.8.43–4, Verg. *Ecl.* 4.31–3, Tib. 1.3.39–40). Elsewhere, Ovid tells us that precious metal was hidden deep down in the earth during the Golden Age (*Am.* 3.8.35–8) and that desire for profit only emerged during the Iron Age (*Met.* 1.131). However, this is the first time that the account of the Golden Age has come from an eyewitness (*videbam*), which might lend Janus' account added authority. So how are we to interpret 193–4?

The reason for the extraordinary statement may lie in the exaggerating tendencies of Janus; see 193–226n. Here, the exaggeration is for dramatic effect: in 193–6, Janus intends to introduce (and justify) his forthcoming diatribe on moral degeneracy by emphasising the vast parameters for the subject, from its inception in the Golden Age to its height in contemporary Rome. In fact, whenever Janus constructs a sentence using *vix* (193, 196, 201), it may indicate a (tentative) exaggeration on his part; see 193–226n.

193 Saturno . . . regnante: similar phrases are regularly sufficient to evoke the Golden Age; cf. *Am.* 3.8.35, Plat. *Pol.* 276a, Verg. *Ecl.* 4.6 *Saturnia regna*, 6.41, Prop. 2.32.52, Tib. 1.3.35 *Saturno . . . rege*, Juv. 6.1.

194 lucra: *lucrum* is often used pejoratively, as here, to refer to the desired outcome of mankind's avaricious pursuits; cf. Cic. *Tusc.* 5.9, Hor. *S.* 1.1.38–40 *cum te neque fervidus aestus/demoveat lucro neque hiems, ignis, mare, ferrum/nil obstet tibi dum ne sit te ditior alter*, Luc. 4.96, Sen. *Phaed.* 540.

195–6 Janus declares that the impious desire for material gain is practically at its peak: the spondaic pentameter—quite rare in Ovid (see Platnauer (1951) 37)—helps to convey the seriousness of the sentiment. Though the sentiment amounts to another exaggeration from Janus (see 193–226n.), it is one frequently adopted by the pessimistic moralist; cf. e.g. Sal. *Cat.* 10ff., Liv. *Praef.* 11–12.

It is worth noting that Janus is a suitable authority for talking about matters of wealth in contemporary Rome, as financial business

was conducted around one of his arches, the *Ianus Medius*; cf. e.g. *Rem.* 561–2, Cic. *Off.* 2.87, Steinby III.93–4.

195 amor . . . habendi: the phrase is typically used in moralistic contexts to denote the human passion of greed; cf. *Ars* 3.541, *Met.* 1.131 *amor sceleratus habendi*, Verg. *A.* 8.326–7 *deterior donec paulatim ac decolor aetas/et belli rabies et amor successit habendi*, Hor. *Ep.* 1.7.85.

196 habet: Ovid is particularly fond of ending couplets with the colourless but metrically convenient verbs *esse* and *habere*; see B. Axelson (1987), *Kleine Schriften zur lateinischen Philologie*, Stockholm, 264ff. The formulation here—a relative clause followed by *habet*—is a common one; cf. 32 *erroremque suum quo tueatur habet*, 86 *nil nisi Romanum, quod tueatur, habet*, *Ars* 2.90 *et trepidat nec, quo sustineatur, habet* with Janka ad loc. In such cases, *habet* is almost surplus to requirements.

197 pluris "held in higher esteem": genitive of (metaphorical) value; cf. e.g. Cic. *Off.* 1.160, Sal. *Jug.* 85.14 *existumate, facta an dicta pluris sint*, *OLD* s.v. 5b, Lewis/Short s.v. II.2.

prisci temporis annis "in the years of ancient time": for similar phraseology, cf. e.g. *Met.* 15.226 *medii . . . temporis annis* (Pythagoras), Tib. 1.8.47 *primi . . . temporis aetas*. *priscus* often has, as here, a positive moral charge; cf. e.g. Verg. *A.* 6.878, Hor. *Saec.* 57–8 *iam Fides et Pax et Honos Pudorque/priscus et neglecta redire Virtus*, Tib. 2.3.68.

198 populus pauper: *pauper* is best translated 'living modestly' and is to be distinguished from *egens*, 'wanting, impoverished'; for the distinction, cf. Sen. *Ep.* 87.40, Serv. *G.* 1.146. *paupertas* is regularly hailed as a virtue of early Rome; cf. Sal. *Cat.* 12.1, Verg. *A.* 8.105, V. Max. 4.4, Luc. 10.151, Sil. 1.609–10 *concilium vocat augustum castaque beatos/paupertate patres.*

199 dum casa Martigenam capiebat parva Quirinum: a clear reference to the *casa Romuli*. This small hut, made of sticks and reeds, was the traditional dwelling of king Romulus. It was apparently preserved in Ovid's day, on the southwest corner of the Palatine, where it faced the Circus Maximus near the *Scalae Caci*; cf. 3.183–4, Dion. Hal. 1.79.11, Plu. *Rom.* 20.4, Platner/Ashby 101–2, Steinby I.241. There is evidence that a replica *casa* was later constructed on the Capitoline; cf. Vitr. 2.1.5, Sen. *Con.* 2.1.5. The *casa Romuli* was a potent symbol of early Rome's morality, in that it highlighted the Romans' contentment with a frugal lifestyle, irrespective of status (cf. also 204, 207). As such, it is regularly held up as a moral paradigm, especially in the face of modern day degeneracy; cf. Verg. *A.* 8.654 (enshrined on Aeneas' shield), Prop. 2.16.19–20 *atque utinam Romae*

nemo esset dives, et ipse/ straminea posset dux habitare casa, 4.10.17–18, Vitr. 2.1.5, Sen. *Con.* 2.1.5, V. Max. 4.4.11, Sen. *Dial.* 12.9.3.

Martigena is first found in Ovid; cf. *Am.* 3.4.39, Stat. *Theb.* 10.103, Sil. 12.582. Adjectives ending in *-gena,* modelled on Greek compounds in -γένης, have an archaic feel and are predominantly found in the higher poetic genres; cf. *Cadmogenus* (Acc. *Trag.* fr. 642 Ribbeck), *Graiugena* (Pac. *Trag.* fr. 364 Ribbeck, Lucr. 1.477, Verg. *A.* 3.550), *Troiugena* (Lucr. 1.465, Cat. 64.355), *anguigena* (*Met.* 3.531), *draconigena* (*Fast.* 3.865). *Quirinus* is the name commonly identified with the deified Romulus (see 37n.) and has a proleptic sense here. This grand phraseology serves to reinforce the moral message: though Romulus is both born from a god and destined to become a god, even he is content to live in humble surroundings.

200 et dabat exiguum fluminis ulva torum "and river sedge provided him with a small couch": sedge was a readily-available resource for the peasant; cf. e.g. *Met.* 6.345, Hor. *S.* 2.4.42 (fodder for the 'poor' Laurentine boar). As such, it becomes symbolic of the pious Romans' willingness to make do with what they had, and the specific image here is a favourite of Ovid's; cf. 5.519–20 *flumineam lino celantibus ulvam/. . . incubuere toris* (Hyrieus), *Met.* 8.655 *concutiuntque torum de molli fluminis ulva* (Baucis and Philemon), Vitr. 2.1.5, also 202n.; for the motif of the 'humble couch', indicative of the owner's morality, cf. also Hom. *Od.* 14.48ff. (Eumaios), Call. *Hecale* fr. 240 Pf., Verg. *A.* 8.366–8 (Evander).

201–2 "Jupiter could scarcely stand upright in his cramped temple, and in the right hand of Jupiter there was a thunderbolt made of clay": in comparisons between early Roman temples and their lavish contemporary counterparts, attention is often drawn to the fact that early statues of gods were typically made out of (cheap) terracotta; cf. Prop. 4.1.5 *fictilibus crevere deis haec aurea templa,* Liv. 34.4.4, Sen. *Con.* 2.1.18, Plin. *Nat.* 34.34.4, Sen. *Ep.* 31.11, *Dial.* 12.10.7, Juv. 11.116 *fictilis et nullo violatus Iuppiter auro*; cf. also Tib. 1.10.19–20 *tunc melius tenuere fidem cum paupere cultu/stabat in exigua ligneus aede deus.* However, the specific (amusing) depiction of Jupiter that we are given here encourages us to inquire whether Janus has a specific temple in mind.

Commentators tend to read 201–2 as an allusion to the temple of Jupiter Feretrius, apparently the first temple to be built in Rome, which housed the *spolia opima* won from Acron, king of Caenina; for this view, see e.g. Frazer ad loc., Bömer ad loc., Le Bonniec ad loc.

However, there is a problem with this identification: no other source suggests that the temple of Jupiter Feretrius ever housed a statue of the god. Instead, it is more appropriate to read these lines as an allusion to the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitoline. This temple was originally vowed and started by Tarquinius Priscus in the midst of war with the Sabines, but it was his successor Tarquinius Superbus who did most of the building work; cf. Cic. *Rep.* 2.36, 44, Liv. 1.38.7, 53.2–3, Dion. Hal. 3.69, Platner/Ashby 297ff., Steinby III.144ff. We are specifically told that Priscus commissioned a native of Veii, named Vulca, to construct a statue of Jupiter out of clay to be placed in the temple; cf. Cic. *Div.* 1.16 with Pease ad loc., Plin. *Nat.* 35.157. In the absence of any positive evidence for a statue in the temple of Jupiter Feretrius, it is likely that this is the statue to which Janus alludes in 202. This temple was destroyed by fire in 83 B.C. and rebuilt more lavishly by Q. Lutatius Catulus. Among the changes, we are told, the clay statue was replaced by one made of gold and ivory (Joseph. *Ant. Iud.* 19.1.2). Janus is thus inviting comparison between the temple in its earliest, more modest manifestation and its luxurious present day counterpart; see also 203n.

201 Iuppiter angusta vix totus stabat in aede: Janus goes further than previous descriptions of early Rome's modest worship (for which, see 201–2n.) by suggesting that the statue could hardly fit its surroundings. Since we do not know the exact size of the first temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus (see Platner/Ashby s.v. 297–8), Janus' comment may amount to an exaggeration, as his moralistic nostalgia gets the better of him; for other examples, see 193–226n. However, it is worth noting that some ancient temples may have been no bigger than the statues they housed: for example, the shrine of Janus Geminus was apparently only five cubits high, barely large enough to cover the statue of the god (Procop. 5.25.20).

202 inque Iovis dextra fictile fulmen erat: the thunderbolt was the traditional weapon of Jupiter, and he is typically depicted brandishing it in his right hand; cf. *Am.* 3.3.30 *in nos alta Iovis dextera fulmen habet. fictilis* denotes anything made from clay; cf. Tib. 1.1.39–40 *fictilia antiquus primum sibi fecit agrestis/pocula de facili composuitque luto*, Isid. *Orig.* 20.4.2, Maltby s.v. 232. As such, *fictilia* becomes symbolic of earlier generations' morality, indicative of their willingness to make use of materials which were readily available to them rather than seek more lavish alternatives (such as gold); cf. e.g. *Met.* 8.668 (Baucis and Philemon's goodness), Prop. 4.1.5 (quoted in

201–2n.). Nevertheless, the collocation *fictile fulmen* is novel (*Thes.* 6.1.647.48–9) and lightheartedly incongruous.

203 frondibus ornabant quae nunc Capitolia gemmis: the Capitoline is a regular point of reference in comparisons between early and contemporary Rome; cf. *Ars* 3.115–16, Var. *Vit. Pop. Rom.* fr. 15 Rip., Verg. *A.* 8.347–8 *hinc ad Tarpeiam sedem et Capitolia ducit,/aurea nunc, olim silvestribus horrida dumis*, Tib. 2.5.23ff., V. Max. 4.4.11. As here, *Capitolium* regularly refers to the most prominent landmark on the hill, namely the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus; see Platner/Ashby s.v. *Capitolinus mons*, Steinby I.226ff. s.v. *Capitolium.*

Though precious stones (*gemmis*) might be viewed as a conventional detail of contemporary temples (cf. e.g. Sen. *Dial.* 12.10.7), Janus' comment may have special political significance. As part of Augustus' much-advertised restoration of religious buildings, he is reputed to have spent fifty million sesterces adorning the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus with gold and jewels; cf. Suet. *Aug.* 30.4, Aug. *RG* 4.9, Dio 51.22, Platner/Ashby 300, Steinby III.150. If Janus is alluding to this act, there are worrying consequences: to highlight this incident as an example of contemporary moral degeneracy is to blur the (uneasy) Roman/Augustan distinction between 'acceptable' public extravagance and 'unacceptable' private extravagance; for the distinction, cf. e.g. Cic. *Mur.* 76, Sal. *Cat.* 12.3–4, Hor. *Carm.* 2.15.15 with Nisbet/Hubbard ad loc. The potential controversy is only partly mitigated by the exaggerating tendencies of the speaker; for exploitation of the disharmony in Augustan discourse elsewhere, see 193–226n.

204 pascebatque suas ipse senator oves: nostalgic impressions of early Rome such as this serve to highlight the lack of discrimination that existed between urban and rural duties, as well as the 'hardy' rural origins of the Roman leaders themselves; cf. e.g. 3.780 *et faceret patrio rure senator opus*, Prop. 4.1.11–12 *Curia, praetexto quae nunc nitet alta senatu/pellitos habuit, rustica corda, Patres*; see also 207–8n. The juxtaposition of *suas ipse* reinforces the contrast: unlike farm owners in modern Rome, who employ slaves to work the land, early leaders took a personal responsibility in the maintenance of the fields.

205 nec pudor: the speaker looks on the morality of the past from a modern, materialistic viewpoint; for similar use of the tactic, cf. e.g. 4.367–8 (humble offering to Cybele), Prop. 4.1.6 *nec fuit opprobrio facta sine arte casa.*

stipula, 'straw', is regularly viewed as a resource used by the early inhabitants of Rome and indicative of their morality; cf. 3.185

in stipula placidi capiebat munera somni (Romulus), 6.261 *quae nunc aere vides, stipula tum tecta videres, Ars* 3.117–18. In order to promote an image of personal morality, Augustus himself is reputed to have slept in a 'humble' bed; cf. Suet. *Aug.* 73 *nec toro quidem cubuisse aiunt nisi humili et modice instrato.*

placidam cepisse quietem: for the idiom *quietem capere* 'to take repose', cf. *Met.* 1.626, Sisenna fr. 45 Peter *capere non poterat quietem,* Cic. *Att.* 9.11.4, V. Max. 8.1.13; for *somnum capere,* cf. 3.185 *placidi capiebat . . . somni,* 6.331, Pl. *Mil.* 709. *placida quies* is a regular poetic collocation to denote a good sleep; cf. 6.331, *Met.* 9.469, Verg. *A.* 1.691, 4.5 with Pease ad loc. In the present moralistic context, however, *placidam* may have particular poignancy: peaceful, carefree sleep was often felt to be dependent on a modest lifestyle; the wealthy, by contrast, could expect fearful and sleepless nights; for the sentiment, cf. Hor. *S.* 1.1.76–8, *Carm.* 2.16.15 with Nisbet/Hubbard ad loc., 3.1.21ff., *Ep.* 1.10.18, Sen. *Phaed.* 520–1.

206 et fenum capiti subposuisse fuit: like *stipula* (205), hay is a material typically used in contrasts between modern Rome and its early, moral counterpart; cf. 3.115 *illa quidem <e> feno, sed erat reverentia feno/quantam nunc aquilas cernis habere tuas,* Prop. 4.1.19–20 (early celebrations of the Parilia).

207–8 This couplet takes us forward in time from early Rome to events in the early/middle Republic. Stories of Roman leaders who take office after working in the fields (207 *posito . . . aratro*) are popular in Roman literature, and circulate around two individuals in particular. Most famously, in 458 B.C., L. Quinctius Cincinnatus was reputed to have been found ploughing his fields when he was summoned to become dictator at a time of national emergency; cf. e.g. Cic. *Sen.* 56, Plin. *Nat.* 18.20. Later, in 257 B.C., C. Atilius Serranus was declared consul in similar circumstances; cf. Cic. *Sest.* 72, *Rosc.* 50, V. Max. 4.4.5. Such individuals are regularly held up as *exempla* to highlight the frugal lifestyle and work ethic of Roman leaders of old, compared to their counterparts in contemporary Rome, who indulge in luxury and pleasure; cf. 3.781; Liv. 2.36.6–12; Sen. *Con.* 2.1.8; V. Max. 4.4; Col. 1. *Praef.* 13–14; also Plin. *Nat.* 19.87 (the Roman leader Manius Curius Dentatus is found roasting turnips when the enemy envoys arrive); *Thes.* 2.400.64ff.

The morality of Republican Rome is also evidenced by the fact that there were strict rules governing the amount of silver permissible for private ownership; cf. e.g. V. Max. 4.4.11 *nullum aut admodum*

parvi ponderis argentum . . . cernimus. Pliny informs us (*Nat.* 33.153) that ownership of a silver dish or saltcellar was the acceptable limit in middle Republican Rome. Indeed, P. Cornelius Rufinus was apparently expelled from the Senate in 275 B.C. for owning ten pounds of silver, an event which is regularly highlighted as a noble example of moral rectitude; cf. Liv. *Per.* 13, Plin. *Nat.* 18.39 *denas argenti libras . . . crimini dabant,* 33.142, Gel. 4.8.7, 17.21.39.

207 iura dabat . . . praetor: *praetor* ((A)Mω) might at first appear a more difficult reading than *consul* (Uς), given that the famous Roman individuals in the middle Republic were called to take up the position of either dictator or consul, i.e. higher than that of praetor (see 207–8n.). But the reading *praetor* should be retained on the grounds that it is an old generic term for a 'leader' (*praeeo* 'I go before') in both military and judicial matters; cf. Var. *L.* 5.87, Cic. *Leg.* 3.8 *iuris disceptator, qui privata iudicet iudicarive iubeat, praetor esto,* Maltby 493–4 s.v.; for the later responsibility of the praetor for the administration of justice; see *OCD* s.v.

208 levis argenti lammina: *lam(m)ina* is regularly used to denote any thin piece of metal; cf. *Met.* 9.170, 11.124, Hor. *Carm.* 2.2.2 with Nisbet/Hubbard ad loc., Sen. *Ben.* 7.10.1, *Thes.* 7.2.906.20ff. *lam(m)ina* is already diminutive in sense, so the collocation with *levis* only heightens the strictness of the legislation on luxury in Republican Rome.

209–12 Janus proceeds to chart the moral decline of Rome. The belief that moral decline came about due to Rome's prosperity (*fortuna* (209)) and the influx of wealth (*creverunt . . . opes* (211)) is well-established among moralist writers, who mark the beginning of crisis at some point during the second century B.C.; cf. Liv. *Praef.* 11 with Ogilvie ad loc., 34.4.3 *quo melior laetiorque in dies fortuna rei publicae est imperiumque crescit . . . eo plus horreo ne illae magis res nos ceperint quam nos illas* (Cato), Sal. *Cat.* 10.1 with McGushin ad loc., Edwards (1993) 176ff.

209 at postquam fortuna loci caput extulit huius "but when prosperity had raised the head of this place (i.e. Rome)": commentators/translators are unanimous in taking *loci . . . huius* with *fortuna,* thus personifying fortune as a deity who is inherent to the location; cf. "But ever since the Fortune of this place had raised her head on high" (Frazer), Bömer, Nagle, "But after the fortune of this place lifted her head" (Boyle/Woodard). Although this is possible, it is awkward: the notion of a fortune inherent to a place is rare (cf. possibly 4.507 *fors* (**AU**ω) *sua cuique loco est*); moreover, the couplet would present us with an awkward situation whereby two different

personifications (Fortuna, Roma) raise their heads. It seems more natural to take *fortuna* as 'prosperity/favourable circumstances' (*OLD* s.v. 9) and *loci* . . . *huius* with *caput*, the noun encompassed by the phrase. Lines 209–10 thus present the consistent image of a proud Rome with raised head (cf. e.g. 4.255–6, Sil. 1.29–30); as is fitting for the elegiac couplet, the pentameter reiterates the sentiment of the hexameter.

210 tetigit . . . Roma deos: hyperbolic expressions for reaching the heights usually involve the stars; cf. 3.34 *contigeratque sua sidera summa coma* (tree); *Met.* 1.316; Hor. *Carm.* 1.1.36 *sublimi feriam sidera vertice* with Nisbet/Hubbard ad loc.; Verg. *A.* 4.177 with Pease ad loc.; Prop. 1.8.43. Janus exaggerates here still further by suggesting that Rome has reached the gods themselves. As such, his sentiment has potentially sinister, almost Gigantomachic overtones: Rome is unnaturally and impiously challenging its place in the scheme of things.

211–12 Janus draws attention to the circularity and insatiability of avarice—the greater the accumulation of wealth, the greater the desire—which was a stock theme of moralists; cf. Publilius Syrus ap. Sen. *Ep.* 94.43 *avarus animus nullo satiatur lucro*; Sal. *Cat.* 11.3 *avaritia . . . semper infinita, insatiabilis est, neque copia neque inopia minuitur*; Liv. *Praef.* 11; Hor. *Carm.* 2.2.13 with Nisbet/Hubbard ad loc.; *Ep.* 1.2.56; Sen. *Dial.* 12.11.4; Otto (1890) 50–1. The perpetuity of the vice is emphasised by the repetition of sound in *et opes et opum* (211) and *plurima plura* (212); Janus' contempt for the situation is heightened by the alliteration of 'p', especially in 212.

211 furiosa cupido: for such expressions of mad, uncontrollable desire, cf. *Ars* 1.281 *furiosa libido*, Cic. *Cat.* 1.25 *tua ista cupiditas effrenata ac furiosa*, Apul. *Met.* 8.3, *Thes.* 6.1.1621.15ff.

212 possideant: a strong verb, 'have/take control over' (*OLD* s.v. 1, 3).

213–14 "They struggle for acquisition so that they can consume; once it has been consumed, they struggle for acquisition again: and this very alternation (between seeking and consuming) provides nourishment for their vices": the vicious cycle of vice here is that of *avaritia* (greedy acquisition) and *luxuria* (indulgent consumption), a favourite topic of moralists; cf. Sal. *Cat.* 13.5 *animus . . . eo profusius omnibus modis quaestui atque sumptui deditus erat*; Liv. *Praef.* 12 *nuper divitiae avaritiam et abundantes voluptates desiderium per luxum atque libidinem pereundi perdendique omnia invexere*; Edwards (1993) 178ff.; cf. also *Met.* 8.834 *plusque cupit, quo plura suam demittit in alvum*, 840–2 *Erysichthonis ora profani/accipiunt*

poscuntque simul. cibus omnis in illo/causa cibi est (perpetual hunger of Erysichthon). The cyclic nature of the vices is mirrored in the chiastic phraseology *quaerere ut absumant, absumpta requirere* (213). Furthermore, the juxtaposition of verb and participle (*absumant absumpta*) moves the reader quickly into the next clause and emphasises the speed of consumption; for the technique, a favourite of Ovid's, cf. *Am.* 1.2.52, 3.8.7, *Ars* 1.481, *Tr.* 2.21, Wills (1996) 320.

214 alimenta: for the metaphorical usage as 'fuel' for a passion, cf. *Am.* 2.19.24, *Met.* 3.479, Prop. 3.21.4, *Thes.* 1.1587.3ff.

215–16 The condition described here is dropsy (oedema), which was believed to be an unusual accumulation of water in the tissue, causing swelling and an unquenchable thirst in the patient; drinking only made the condition worse; cf. esp. Cels. 3.21.2, 4. The disease was (wrongly) attributed to over-indulgence by the ancients. As such, it became a suitable analogy for moral vice from Cynic diatribe onwards; cf. Diogenes ap. Stob. 3.10.45, Lucil. 764 Marx, Hor. *Carm.* 2.2.13 with Nisbet/Hubbard ad loc., Sen. *Dial.* 12.11.3.

215 intumuit: Ovid is the first to use *intumesco* in the medical sense to refer to bodily swelling caused by disease; cf. Cels. 3.22.2, 4.15.2 *ubi inveteravit malum, venter et crura pedesque intumescunt*, Plin. *Nat.* 20.51, *Thes.* 7.2.98.73ff.; for *tumeo* to describe bodily swelling, cf. Pers. 3.63 (dropsy), *OLD* s.v. 1b.

suffusa . . . ab unda "caused by a welling-up of water": creative periphrasis for the disease technically known as ὕδρωψ (*hydrops*); for the general avoidance of technical medical vocabulary in 'high' poetic genres, see D. Langslow in Adams/Mayer (1999) 188–98 esp. 197. *suffundo* is typically used of a liquid rising up to the surface of the body (usually blood), cf. e.g. Cic. *Tusc.* 1.19, Cels. 6.6.39a *extrinsecus vero interdum sic ictus oculum laedit, ut sanguis in eo suffundatur*, Plin. *Nat.* 11.224, *OLD* s.v. 2. *unda*, evoking the sea, is effective hyperbole for the condition (cf. the plural *aquae* (216)).

216 sitiuntur: the literal rendering of the transitive verb, '(a liquid) is thirsted for', is rare (cf. Mart. 10.96.3), and *OLD* and Lewis/Short can only provide one other example of the passive form; cf. Plin. *Nat.* 17.15 *ergo umor ex his non universus ingurgitans diluensque, sed quomodo sititur destillans velut ex ubere, alit omnia quia non inundat.*

217–18 Janus finishes his moral diatribe with a rhetorical flourish of short, punchy statements. The ideas here have been well-rehearsed by moralists. For the opening sentiment that man is only worth as much as his financial assets (*in pretio pretium nunc est* (217)), cf. Pind.

Isth. 2.11, Lucil. 1066 Marx, Hor. *S.* 1.1.62 *nil satis est ... quia tanti quantum habeas sis*, Sen. *Ep.* 115.14, Petr. 77.6, Juv. 3.143, Otto (1890) 157, *Thes.* 3.809.48ff. The second sentiment (217–18) draws attention to the importance of money for political advancement at Rome: those with money have all the power, whilst the poor man is excluded. The sentiment is regularly articulated, as here, with anaphora of *census*; cf. *Am.* 3.8.55–6 *curia pauperibus clausa est—dat census honores;/inde gravis iudex, inde severus eques!*; Sen. *Con.* 2.1.17 *census senatorium gradum ascendit, census equitem Romanum a plebe secernit, census in castris ordinem promovet, census iudices in foro legit*; Plin. *Nat.* 14.5 *postquam senator censu legi coeptus, iudex fieri censu, magistratum ducemque nihil exornare quam census*; cf. also *Ars* 2.277–8, Prop. 3.13.47–50 (the same sentiment using repetition of *aurum*).

217 in pretio pretium nunc est: *in pretio esse* is a well-established idiom which means 'to be regarded as valuable/to be prized'; cf. e.g. 4.405, 5.58, 6.33 *si torus in pretio est, dicor matrona Tonantis* (Juno), Pl. *Asin.* 61, Cic. *Rosc.* 72, *Thes.* 10.2.1213.37ff. The sentence could therefore be translated: 'Nowadays, price is held in high regard'. But the juxtaposition of *pretio pretium* might encourage a more literal translation which plays on the meanings of *pretium*: 'Nowadays, price (i.e. how one is esteemed) is in one's price (i.e. financial assets)'.

honores "political office": see 217–18n.

218 amicitias: *amicitia* originally referred to a personal friendship which carried with it social obligation (especially reciprocity). The term was subsequently used (as here) in the political sphere to refer to mutually-beneficial 'alliances', which were claimed to be instances of personal friendship; see J. Powell (1990), *Cicero: Laelius, On Friendship & The Dream of Scipio*, Wiltshire, 21–3.

pauper ubique iacet "the poor man everywhere is despised": the final sentiment makes a telling contrast between early and contemporary Rome: *paupertas*, hailed as a virtue in early Rome (see 198n.), is now despised. Such short, punchy sentences typically strike a pessimistic conclusion to moralistic discourse; cf. e.g. *Met.* 1.149 *victa iacet pietas* (the Iron Age), Juv. 1.74 *probitas laudatur et alget* (vice in modern Rome). For *iaceo* in the sense 'to lie low in estimation, be despised', cf. e.g. *Am.* 2.2.30 *ille potens; alii, sordida turba, iacent*, Cic. *Att.* 2.17.2, *Thes.* 7.1.28.81ff.

219–20 tu tamen auspicium si sit stipis utile quaeris,/curque iuvent nostras (Mω) aera vetusta manus: these lines, missing

from the principal manuscript (**A**), interrupt the flow of the moral diatribe but are very important for the characterisation of Janus. Frazer interpreted these lines as a sarcastic remark from Janus who pokes fun again (cf. 191–2) at the questioner's apparent naivety concerning the predominance of wealth in his own society: 'And still you ask me, what's the use of omens drawn from cash, and why do ancient coppers tickle your (*vestras* (**UA**²)) palms!' However, such a translation makes little sense in the context: Janus' diatribe has detailed human degeneracy and has not explained why money should bring good omen from the *gods*; besides, Ovid had not asked of Janus the reason for his *own* age's obsession with money. It is better to interpret these lines as a sudden realisation on Janus' part (indicated by *tamen*) that he has been digressing and not answering Ovid's original question at 189–90; cf. e.g. 'But I digress. You wanted to know if cash augurs well and why our palms itch for old copper coins' (Nagle), Boyle/Woodard. As such, this is the clearest indication in the section of Janus' tendency to reminisce at any opportunity; see further 193–226n.

Previously, Janus had suggested that the gods were detached from this era of moral degeneracy (see 191–2n.); this is the first real suggestion that the gods do enjoy a certain amount of 'luxury' in the form of bronze coins (220 *iuvent . . . aera*); for the gradual revelation of the gods' degeneracy, see 223–6n.

221 aera dabant olim: melius nunc omen in auro est: Janus here refers obliquely to the history and development of Roman coinage. The earliest form of currency was popularly supposed to be cattle (for the common etymology of *pecunia* from *pecus*, see Maltby s.v. 459). Bronze bar took the place of cattle as the major means of currency in fifth century B.C. Italy, and the first bronze coinage appeared in late fourth century B.C. *aera* could refer here either to the bronze bars or 'bronze coins' (cf. e.g. *Pont.* 1.1.40, Prop. 4.5.50, Juv. 2.512). Coinage in silver and gold first appeared later, after the second Punic War, and saw its greatest circulation in the times of Julius Caesar and Augustus; see Sutherland (1974) 11ff., 127ff., *OCD* s.v. 'coinage, Roman'. It was therefore felt that gold provided a better omen of financial prosperity for the year; see Meslin (1970) 43–4.

However, Janus' comment that there is better omen in gold is dubious. Gold may be deemed more precious by contemporary Roman *mortals*, so much so that they choose to offer it to the gods; but it can hardly provide a better omen unless the *gods* also take

delight in gold. This anticipates the surprising conclusion to Janus' response (223–6) where the gods are implicated in moral degeneracy; see 223–6n.

222 victaque concessit prisca moneta novae: moral degeneracy is forcefully expressed in terms of military conquest; cf. e.g. *Met.* 1.149 *victa iacet pietas*. *moneta* is a term with a complex history. *Moneta* was originally a cult name given to Juno on the (dubious etymological) basis that she once advised (*moneo*) what sacrifice should be conducted during an earthquake; cf. Cic. *Div.* 1.101 with Pease ad loc. Once a temple to Juno Moneta had been dedicated on the Capitol in 344 B.C. (Liv. 6.20.13, Plu. *Cam.* 36.7), it became the chief location for minting coins; see *Thes.* 8.1413.71ff. From here, Ovid is the first to use *moneta* metonymically to mean 'money'; cf. Mart. 4.28.5 *centum dominos novae monetae*, Apul. *Met.* 9.19, *Thes.* 8.1414.69ff.

223–6 Janus concludes by revealing the gods' own interests in the increased prosperity at Rome: they too enjoy the luxury of the times. This has been gradually revealed to us through the speech: Janus starts as 'detached' observer of the human era (see 191–2n.); he later admits that the gods enjoy 'ancient bronze' (see 219–20n.); now he admits that the gods delight in gold, and refers to the era as 'our years' (see 225n.).

It was common for those who offer discourse on moral degeneracy to introduce themselves into the discourse and give their own reaction. Typically born in the most degenerate age, the speaker is pessimistic and/or wishes he had been born earlier; cf. Hes. *Op.* 174–5 μηκέτ' ἔπειτ' ὤφελλον ἐγὼ πέμπτοισι μετεῖναι/ἀνδράσιν, ἀλλ' ἢ πρόσθε θανεῖν ἢ ἔπειτα γενέσθαι; Cat. 64.22–3 *o nimis optato saeclorum tempore nati/heroes, salvete, deum genus!*; Liv. *Praef.* 9 *acriter intendat animum . . . labente deinde paulatim disciplina velut desidentis primo mores sequatur animo . . . donec ad haec tempora quibus nec vitia nostra nec remedia pati possumus perventum est*; Sen. *Ep.* 47.5. Ovid had famously turned this sentiment on its head in *Ars*, by calling contemporary Rome 'golden' and considering himself much luckier to be living now than in the past; cf. *Ars* 3.113–28 esp. 121–2 *prisca iuvent alios: ego me nunc denique natum/gratulor: haec aetas moribus apta meis* with Gibson ad loc.

Fittingly for a pacifistic god who faces in both directions, Janus tries to mediate between these two viewpoints: he attempts to create harmony by embracing elements from both Roman past and present; for Augustus' attempt to unite past and present, see 193–226n. However, it is an uneasy reconciliation because of the contradictions

in the character of the speaker. Janus' choice of verbs to describe past and present suggests somewhat more enthusiasm for the present: the gods 'take delight in' (223 *iuvant*) and 'enjoy' (225 *utimur*) the benefits of contemporary Rome; the past, on the other hand, is the object of (stale) 'approval' (223 *probemus*) and 'praise' (225 *laudamus*). This is particularly surprising given the preceding moral diatribe (191–218) which (conventionally) denies any positive attribute to contemporary Rome. A similar surprise tactic is adopted later at 5.297ff., where Flora finishes an account of human moral decline with a declaration of the gods' interest in luxury; cf. esp. 5.297–8 *nos quoque tangit honor: festis gaudemus et aris,/turbaque caelestes ambitiosa sumus.* Ultimately, one feels, any consistent message on the relative morality of contemporary Rome and its gods is lost behind the character of the 'two-faced' Janus.

223–4 nos quoque templa . . . aurea: Janus at last reveals the gods' own interest in the luxury of contemporary Rome: the key adjective, *aurea*, is delayed and emphasised in enjambment; see 223–6n. Janus bears witness to the extensive programme of restoration undertaken in the Augustan period, whereby sacred buildings were typically reconstructed using marble and gold; see 70n., 77n.

It has been suggested that Janus is here referring specifically to the restoration of his own temple in the Forum Holitorium, which was completed on 18th October A.D. 17 (Tac. *Ann.* 2.49); see Fränkel (1945) 254, Bömer ad loc. However, specific allusion here is unlikely: not only is *templa aurea* very general (cf. 77 *templorum . . . aurum*), but it is generally held that Ovid died before this time; see Introduction, II.

223 antiqua: it is better to take this with *templa* rather than substantively ('ancient things'); cf. 225, where *veteres* is to be understood with *annis.*

224 maiestas convenit ipsa deo "the very grandeur (sc. of such temples) befits a god": following on from the 223, this is a materialistic comment on the part of Janus. *maiestas* is commonly used to denote the grandeur of outward appearance (*OLD* s.v. 5), and Ovid may be the first to use it of sacred buildings; cf. Suet. *Tib.* 63.1, Apul. *Met.* 5.1, Gel. 4.9.7, *Thes.* 8.154.40ff. The comment amounts to a lighthearted boast from a god who is ever prone to self-aggrandisement; see 89–288 (iii) n.

225 nostris: Janus now confesses that the gods are part of the corrupt era of which he speaks; for his contrasting earlier detachment, see 191–2n.

utimur: though sometimes neutral ('undergo, experience'), the verb usually has a positive sense: 'enjoy' (*OLD* s.v. 11), 'make use of' (*OLD* s.v. 1), 'exploit' (*OLD* s.v. 8b); see 223–6n.

226 mos tamen est aeque dignus uterque coli: fittingly for a pacifist deity, Janus attempts to finish with the conciliatory advice that both past and present should be given equal respect. However, the tensions and contradictions of Janus' earlier comments cannot be so easily reconciled; see 193–226n., 223–6n. The use of the infinitive with *dignus* is a predominantly poetic alternative to *ut* + subjunctive; cf. e.g. *Am.* 2.14.6, *Her.* 4.86, *Ars* 1.670, *Met.* 8.127, Cat. 68.131, Lucr. 5.123, H.-Sz. 350.

227 monitus is regularly used to express the 'counsel, advice' received by humans from divine authority; cf. e.g. 3.167, *Met.* 2.103 *finierat monitus* (Phoebus to Phaethon), Cic. *Har.* 54, Verg. *A.* 4.282, *Thes.* 8.1422.7ff. The noun is also commonly associated with the 'advice, teachings' given by the didactic poet; cf. e.g. *Ars* 2.427–8, 3.48 *haec quoque pars monitis erudienda tuis* with Gibson ad loc., *Rem.* 136, 296; for Janus as didactic poet, see 89–288 (iv) n.

227–8 placidis ita rursus, ut ante,/clavigerum verbis adloquor ipse deum: the poet-interviewer is growing in confidence. First, he was afraid (97–8); then he became calmer, but still felt sufficiently in awe not to look upon the god directly (147–8); now he is completely at ease, addressing the deity (*adloquor*), which suggests eye contact. The juxtaposition of *ipse deum* (228) reflects the comfort that the speaker now feels in the presence of the god. For the interviewer's eagerness to ask questions and learn more, see 165n.

228 clavigerum is here a compound of *clavis* and *gero* ('key-bearer'), first found in Ovid and very rare thereafter; as an epithet for Janus, cf. Opt. Porf. *Carm.* 18.29 *India clavigeri Latium vult iungere Iani*; as an epithet for St. Peter, see *Thes.* 3.1316.66ff. It is identical in form to another compound—also first found in Ovid—of *clava* and *gero* 'club-bearer' (see 544n.). For the significance of Janus' key, see 99n.

229–54 Ovid inquires about the significance of two images—a two-headed figure and a ship—on opposite sides of a particular Roman coin (229–30). Janus responds by identifying himself as the two-headed figure (231–2) and the ship as the vessel which carried Saturn (233–4). Janus proceeds to link the two images by retelling the story of the exiled Saturn's voyage to and reception in Latium during his reign (235–42). In the process, Janus is afforded another

opportunity to reminisce on the early site of Rome and the moral decency of the age in which he reigned (243–52), all of which is strictly irrelevant to Ovid's original question; for Janus' tendency to reminisce fondly, see also 193–226n.

Several examples of the particular coin in question—the *as* (*aes signatum*)—have survived, and the earliest date back to c. 220 B.C.; see Holland (1961) 276ff., Crawford (1974) 147–8, 716–20. Janus' explanation of the symbols—in terms of the myth of Saturn—is attested elsewhere, but there appears to be no consensus; for the mythological aetion, cf. Plu. *Mor.* 274e–275a; Macr. 1.7.21–2; [Aur. Vict.] *Orig. Gent.* 3.1–4; Serv. *A.* 8.357; for the imprint of the ship as a celebration of Janus' invention of ship-building, cf. Plu. *Mor.* 274e–275a; Athen. *Deip.* 692d–e; Frazer on 229; Crawford (1974) 719.

229 multa quidem didici: Ovid responds positively to the instruction he has been given; for the interviewer's enthusiasm, see 165n. As *discere* is regularly used in an instructional manner in didactic poetry (see 101n.), Ovid suggests that Janus has been conducting himself in the manner of the didactic poet; for other examples, see 89–288 (iv) n.

230 signata: *signo* is the standard verb for the stamping of coins; cf. e.g. Cic. *Leg.* 3.6, Liv. 4.60.6, Lewis/Short s.v. 2a, *OLD* s.v. 7.

231 noscere me duplici posses ut (AMω) imagine "so that you might be able to recognise me in the double image": *in* (**Uς**) is an unproblematic reading, creating a unreal conditional clause in 231–2. However, *ut* (better attested) is preferable on the grounds that Ovid regularly increases the spontaneity of dialogue in the poem by having the informer respond to the interviewer's question immediately with a subordinate clause; cf. 173–4 (*ut*), 279–80 (*ut*), 4.355–6 (*quod*).

232 ni vetus ipsa dies extenuasset opus "if time itself had not worn away the ancient handiwork": for *dies* in the sense of 'time, passing of days', cf. e.g. 2.58, Lucr. 1.233, Verg. *A.* 5.783, *OLD* s.v. 10, *Thes.* 5.1.1032.50ff. *extenuo* 'make thin' is commonly used in the extended sense 'wear away', but this would appear to be the only non-metaphorical usage of the verb (i.e. to express the physical wearing away of the coin's surface); for metaphorical usage, cf. e.g. *Pont.* 1.3.25–6 *cura . . . longa est extenuanda mora*, Cic. *Tusc.* 3.34, *Att.* 3.13.1, *Thes.* 5.2.1986.14ff.

233–40 The story of Saturn's arrival and reception in Italy is first (and most famously) found in extant literature at Verg. *A.* 8.314ff., where Saturn ultimately becomes co-ruler with Janus (Verg. *A.* 8.357–8). However, in the Vergilian version, Saturn descends from

the sky; cf. Verg. *A.* 8.319 *ab aetherio venit Saturnus Olympo.* Ovid is the first extant author to mention the god's arrival by boat (233) and hence the first to entertain a connection between this story and the *as* (see 229–54n.).

233 causa ratis superest "the reason for the ship remains": *superest* can mean 'remains' in the sense 'survives' (i.e. the reason for the ship survives, unlike the image of Janus on the coin (231–2)) and in the sense 'remains to be told'. The latter rendering would create a transitional phrase which is typically used by didactic poets (especially Lucretius) to move from one area of instruction to another; cf. *Ars* 3.1–2 *arma dedi Danais in Amazonas; arma supersunt,/quae tibi dem et turmae, Penthesilea, tuae* with Gibson ad loc., Lucr. 1.921, 2.183, 6.906, 6.979–80 *hoc etiam superest, ipsa quam dicere de re/adgredior quod dicendum prius esse videtur,* Verg. *G.* 2.354; for Janus as didactic poet, see 89–288 (iv) n.

Tuscum . . . amnem: a poetic and chronologically 'accurate' reference to the Tiber; see 500n.

234 pererrato: the intensifying prefix *per-* suggests extensive wandering; as such, the verb is particularly popular in describing the plight of exiles; cf. *Am.* 3.13.33 *pererratis profugus terraque fretoque* (Halaesus); *Met.* 3.6 *orbe pererrato* (Cadmus); Verg. *Ecl.* 1.61; *A.* 2.295 (Hector to Aeneas); Sen. *Ap.* 5.3 (Hercules).

falcifer . . . deus "the sickle-bearing god": a clear reference to Saturn. Two separate traditions associate the god with the sickle. In one tradition, Saturn, at the behest of his mother Gaia, castrates with a sickle his father Ouranos, because he was stuffing his wife's children back inside her as soon as they were born; cf. e.g. Hes. *Th.* 154–82, Call. *Aet.* fr. 43.68–72 Pf., Ap. Rhod. 4.984–6. The more popular tradition, however, associates the sickle with Saturn's role as bringer of agriculture into Italy; cf. Ap. Rhod. 4.987–90, Plu. *Mor.* 275a–b, Macr. 1.7.24, [Aur. Vict.] *Orig. Gent.* 3.2, Serv. *A.* 8.319; for the popular derivation of *Saturnus* from *sero/satus* 'sow', cf. Var. *L.* 5.64, August. *C.D.* 7.13, Maltby 546 s.v., O'Hara (1996) 270. *falcifer,* first found at Lucr. 3.642, thus becomes a regular epithet for the god; cf. 5.627, *Ib.* 214, Mart. 5.16.5, 11.6.1, *Thes.* 6.1.175.60ff., 67–8.

235–40 There are many myths which involve deities descending to earth and being hospitably welcomed into the abodes of mortals (theoxeny). Typically, the deities arrive in disguise with the intention

of testing mortals; cf. e.g. 5.495–536 (Hyrieus); *Met.* 1.211–41 (Lycaon); 8.611–724 (Baucis and Philemon); Hom. *Od.* 1.80–95 (Telemachos); Nonn. *Dion.* 18.35; Reece (1993) 47ff., 181ff. Here, however, the god is genuinely in need as an exile; for other stories of exiled gods roaming the earth, cf. Paus. 1.2.5 (Dionysus and Amphictyon); Hyg. *Fab.* 225 (Eleuther); Sil. 7.161ff. (Falernus); A. Burnett (1970), "Pentheus and Dionysus: Host and Guest", *CP* 65, 24–5 n.8.

235 memini: by suggesting that the present event is retold from memory, Janus attempts to establish himself as an authoritative figure; cf. e.g. 5.646 (Tiber), Prop. 4.2.27 (Vertumnus); see also 389n. (*vidi*).

236 caelitibus regnis a Iove pulsus erat: the traditional account has Jupiter forcibly remove his father from power—cf. e.g. Hes. *Th.* 71–3, 453ff., Verg. *A.* 8.319, [Aur. Vict.] *Orig. Gent.* 3.1—but the *reason* for Jupiter's action is glossed over here. Saturn is famously charged with having devoured his own sons through fear of being overthrown by one of them in the future; Jupiter survives this fate by being hidden from his father, his infant wailings drowned out by the music of the Curetes and Corybantes; for the story, cf. 4.197–214. It may be that Janus avoids mentioning Saturn's crime here so as not to jeopardise his forthcoming description of the idyllic age of Italy (241–54); for analysis of the effect of the different stories involving Saturn in the poem, see Parker (1997) 19–33.

caeles ('heavenly') is predominantly used as a substantive (*caelites* 'heavenly beings, gods'); the purely adjectival usage found here is rare; cf. Enn. *Trag.* fr. 270 J. *ego deum genus esse semper dixi et dicam caelitum*, Apul. *Ap.* 12, Avien. *Ar.* 988, *Thes.* 3.67.27ff.

237–8 Janus introduces two terms which derive from Saturn's arrival and reception in Italy. First, Latium, and Italy in general, are regularly referred to as 'Saturnian'; cf. 5.625, 6.31, Enn. *Ann.* fr. 18 *Saturnia tellus* with Skutsch ad loc., Var. *L.* 5.42, Verg. *G.* 2.173, *A.* 8.329, Dion. Hal. 1.34.5, Fest. 430 L.; for the inhabitants themselves as 'Saturnian', cf. Verg. *A.* 7.203 *Saturni gentem*, Sil. 3.711. Secondly, it was popularly held that Latium took its name from its service of hiding (238 *latente*) the god; cf. Verg. *A.* 8.322–3 *Latiumque vocari/maluit, his quoniam latuisset tutus in oris*, Min. Fel. 23.11, Maltby 329 s.v., O'Hara (1996) 207–8.

237 genti mansit Saturnia nomen "the people retained the name 'Saturnian'": for *maneo* with dative of person/thing for

whom/which something persists, cf. *Met.* 1.17, 4.538, Cic. *Sen.* 22, Cat. 61.229, Liv. 1.3.8 *mansit Silviis postea omnibus cognomen qui Albae regnarunt*, *Thes.* 8.286.44ff.

239 at bona posteritas puppem formavit in aere: Janus incorporates much of the wording of the original question (*navalis in aere . . . forma* (229–30)) into his answer; for the technique elsewhere, see 114n.

241–6 Janus now focuses on his own residence at that time, namely the Ianiculum, the long ridge situated on the right bank of the Tiber; for general discussions, see Platner/Ashby 274–5, Steinby III.89–90.

241–2 placidissima laevum/radit harenosi Thybridis unda latus: *Thybris*, though often used as a poetic alternative to *Tiberis*, is, strictly speaking, believed to have been an old name for the river (Plin. *Nat.* 3.53), derived from an ancient king of Veii; cf. Var. *L.* 5.30 *fuerunt qui ab Thebri vicino regulo Veientum dixerint appellatum, primo Thebrim*, Serv. *A.* 8.330, Le Gall (1953) 52, Maltby 609–10 s.v. Janus' compact phraseology here alludes to several recognised features of the river Tiber.

The first notable feature of the Tiber was that its waters were tranquil (*placidissima . . . unda*); cf. 6.227–8, *Ars* 3.386 *nec Tuscus placida devehit amnis aqua*, Verg. *A.* 2.781–2, Plin. *Nat.* 3.54, Rut. Nam. 1.153; possibly also Enn. *Ann.* fr. 163 Sk. It is particularly appropriate for the peaceful deity to highlight—or exaggerate (superlative)—this feature of the river.

Despite this tranquillity on the river surface, the Tiber was equally renowned for its powers of erosion. Janus' comment that the Tiber 'grazes' (*radit*) the side suggests a gradual wearing away of the river-banks which is echoed elsewhere; cf. Verg. *A.* 8.62–3 *ego sum pleno quem flumine cernis/stringentem ripas et pinguia culta secantem* (Tiber speaking), Rut. Nam. 1.180; cf. also Serv. *A.* 8.63, who mentions different names for the river which stem from this power: *Rumon* (*quasi ripas ruminans et exedens*), *Serra* ('saw') and *Tarentum* (*quod ripas terat*). Moreover, though rivers are often referred to as 'sandy'—typically with the epithet *flavus* (see Nisbet/Hubbard on Hor. *Carm.* 1.2.13)—this is a particularly appropriate description of the Tiber, which, owing to its erosive powers, carries vast amounts of silt along its course; cf. 6.228 *detulerit flavis in mare Thybris aquis*, *Met.* 14.448, *Tr.* 5.1.31, Hor. *Carm.* 1.2.13, 2.3.18, Le Gall (1953) 22ff.; for *harenosus* used of rivers/sea, cf. e.g. 3.737 (Hebrus), *Met.* 1.702 (Ladon), Sil. 3.465, *Thes.* 6.3.2533.5ff.

As the Ianiculum is situated on the right side of the Tiber (accord-

ing to the direction of the water flow [Le Gall (1953) 3ff.]), Janus correspondingly refers to the Tiber as grazing the left side of the hill (*laevum . . . latus*).

243–4 Janus reminisces on the pre-Romulan site of the future city. In comparisons between modern Rome and the ancient site, attention is regularly drawn to its former rural state; cf. 203 (*frondibus*), 5.93 (*arbor et herbae*), 5.639, Prop. 4.1.1–2, 4.4.13–14; for the specific detail of woodland (*silva*), cf. Verg. *A.* 8.347–8 *hinc ad Tarpeiam sedem et Capitolia ducit/aurea nunc, olim silvestribus horrida dumis.* More specifically, the ancient site is also typically described as a feeding-ground for cattle; cf. 204, 5.94, 5.639–40, *Ars* 3.119–20 *quae nunc sub Phoebo ducibusque Palatia fulgent,/quid nisi araturis pascua bubus erant?*, Verg. *A.* 8.359–61, Prop. 3.9.49, 4.9.20, Tib. 2.5.25, 55–6; for the popular etymologies of Roman locations from cattle; see Maltby 443 s.v. 'Palatium', 582 s.v. 'Forum Boarium'.

Janus' use of the demonstrative (*hic*) suggests that the scene is set at the centre of Rome, with Janus acting as tour guide for his student, pointing out the places of historical interest; cf. also 258 *hic ubi iuncta foris templa duobus habes*, 263n. In adopting a mimetic approach here, Ovid may be simply following his immediate predecessors: cf. Prop. 4.1 (the poet guiding his 'guest' around the sites of Rome) and, most famously, Verg. *A.* 8.306ff. (Aeneas' guided tour of Evander's city). However, the use of demonstratives in this section might also be a 'realistic' ploy: as Janus is perceived as visiting Ovid's home (94), which was, according to the poet, situated adjacent to the Capitol (*Tr.* 1.3.29–30), he might realistically be able to point out the sites of Rome.

243 hic, ubi nunc Roma est: a common formula in such comparisons; cf. 2.280 *hic, ubi nunc urbs est*, 391, 5.93 *hic, ubi nunc Roma est*, Prop. 4.1.1 *hoc . . . qua maxima Roma est.*

incaedua: first found in Ovid, the adjective is rare and only used of trees; cf. 2.435–6 *monte sub Esquilio multis incaeduus annis/Iunonis magnae nomine lucus erat*, *Am.* 3.1.1, Stat. *Theb.* 6.90, *Thes.* 7.1.842.82ff. The adjective is not neutral in tone: its usage elsewhere to describe *sacred* groves gives it distinct moral overtones ('unviolated'). As such, the implication that the wood has been cut down during the growth of Rome may have a distinctly negative charge; for other sinister impressions of contemporary Rome from Janus, see 193–226n.

245–6 arx mea collis erat, quem volgo nomine nostro/nuncupat haec aetas Ianiculumque vocat "my citadel was a hill,

which the present age commonly proclaims by my name and calls Ianiculum": *volgo* (Heinsius)—used elsewhere by Ovid at *Pont.* 3.4.19—is a simple emendation for the MSS *volgus*. The problem with *volgus* is that it pointlessly creates two subjects for the sentence: the sense of *volgus* is already contained within the more general *haec aetas*.

It was widely assumed that the hill took the name Ianiculum from its status as Janus' residence; cf. e.g. Verg. *A.* 8.357–8 *hanc Ianus pater, hanc Saturnus condidit arcem;/Ianiculum huic, illi fuerat Saturnia nomen*; Min. Fel. 21.6; August. *C.D.* 7.4; Serv. *A.* 8.319, 357; Macr. 1.7.19; Holland (1961) 230–3; Maltby 289 s.v. The phraseology suggests, however, that Janus is entertaining a more precise etymology here: i) Janus' citadel was a hill (*collis*); ii) the present age commonly calls it by his name (*Ianus*); iii) therefore, it is now called Ianiculum (*Iani* + *collis*, 'the hill of Janus'?). Janus implies that Ianiculum is only a *modern* name for the hill; for possible previous names, cf. Dion. Hal. 1.73 (formerly the city Aeneia), Plin. *Nat.* 3.68 (Antipolis).

246 nuncupat: this is the formal verb for the official naming of (religious) institutions; cf. *Met.* 14.607–8 *contigit os fecitque deum, quem turba Quirini/nuncupat Indigetem temploque arisque recepit*; Var. *Ant.* fr. 15, 16 Card.; Suet. *Aug.* 31.2; Tac. *Ann.* 3.71; M. Puelma (1980), "Cicero als Platon-Übersetzer", *MH* 37, 169.

247–8 Janus revels in the harmony that existed between god and man during his rule: the juxtaposition of *humanis numina* mirrors the sense. Gods traditionally mingled freely with mortals in all the ages leading up to the Iron Age; cf. Cat. 64.384–96 (Heroic Age), Verg. *Ecl.* 4.15–16 *ille deum vitam accipiet divisque videbit/permixtos heroas et ipse videbitur illis* (prophecy of reversal of ages).

249–50 Justice, also known as the maiden Astraea, was traditionally the last deity to abandon the earth, an event which symbolised the end of direct contact between man and god; cf. *Met.* 1.149–50, Arat. 133–6, Hyg. *Astron.* 2.25, Verg. *Ecl.* 4.6 (by inference), *G.* 2.473–4, Juv. 6.19–20; cf. also Hes. *Op.* 197–200 (Aidos and Nemesis are the last to leave earth). However, in the above cases the suggestion is that Justice, sensing the decline, leaves of her own accord. The sense here that Justice was (forcefully) put to flight (*fugarat*) is reminiscent of Cat. 64.398: *iustitiamque omnes cupida de mente fugarunt.*

249 nondum: see 339n.

251 proque metu populum sine vi pudor ipse regebat: "Instead of fear and without enforcement, shame itself guided the people": for the absence of a formal judicial system in morally decent

ages, owing to the people's strong sense of shame, cf. *Met.* 1.89–91 *aurea prima sata est aetas, quae vindice nullo/sponte sua, sine lege fidem rectumque colebat./poena metusque aberant,* Hor. *Carm.* 4.5.20–2 (return of the Golden Age under Augustus); also *Met.* 1.129 *fugere pudor verumque fidesque* (Bronze age), Hes. *Op.* 197–200 (Aidos abandons earth in corrupt age). *rego* is elsewhere used in the sense of 'guiding morally'—cf. Pl. *Bac.* 494, Cic. *Off.* 1.122, Verg. *A.* 1.153, *OLD* s.v. 8—but this may be the only example of its usage with an inanimate subject.

252 nullus erat iustis reddere iura labor: though less common than *iura do, iura reddo* is a recognised idiom for 'administering justice'; cf. e.g. *Met.* 14.823–4 *reddentemque suo non regia iura Quiriti/abstulit Iliaden, Pont.* 4.7.2, 4.9.43, Liv. 10.22.7, *Thes.* 7.2.697.31ff. However, the close proximity of *iustis* and *iura* might call for a more literal and pointed translation here: 'it was no toil to give back justice to those who themselves give out justice'.

253–4 Janus concludes by stressing his distance from warfare and affiliation with peace. In doing so, Janus reflects the thematic and generic outlook for the poem itself, which likewise purports to reject arms for more 'peaceful' subject-matter; see 13–14n. More specifically, Janus says that his key—symbol of peace because it keeps his temple locked (see 279–82n.)—is the only type of 'arms' he possesses (254). This humble sentiment is reminiscent of the elegiac poet himself, who typically attempts to justify his decision not to write epic (i.e. deal with arms and war) by suggesting that his own 'arms' lie in a different field; cf. 2.7–10 *idem sacra cano signataque tempora fastis:/ecquis ad haec illinc crederet esse viam?/haec mea militia est; ferimus quae possumus arma,/dextraque non omni munere nostra vacat,* Prop. 1.6.29–30.

However, given that Janus' temple has the important function of keeping War or warring peoples enclosed in his temple (see 279–82n.), he cannot dissociate himself from military affairs so easily. This difficulty in banishing arms completely is also apparent in the poem itself; see 13–14n.

253 nil mihi cum bello "I have nothing to do with war": this colloquial idiom (*esse alicui cum aliquo*) is an Ovidian favourite; cf. 3.3 *forsitan ipse roges quid sit cum Marte poetae*; *Am.* 1.7.27; 2.19.57; 3.2.48 *nil mihi cum pelago*; *Her.* 14.65; *Met.* 1.456; Pl. *Men.* 826; Cic. *Rosc.* 30.84; G. Stanton (1973), "*Quid ergo Athenis et Hierosolymis? Quid mihi tecum est?*", *RhM* 116, 85ff.

pacem postesque tuebar: an example of syllepsis, a favourite Ovidian figure; see 597n. Though Janus alludes to his temple here

(*postes*), we should take *pacem* ... *tuebar* as a general statement of Janus' affiliation with peace rather than as evidence of a conceptualisation of Janus as physical guardian of Peace within his temple; see 279–82n.

254 clavem ostendens: for the inclusion of deity mannerisms as a means of enlivening the account, see 177n.

255–6 presserat ora deus. tunc sic ego nostra resolvi,/voce mea voces eliciente dei "The god closed his mouth. Then I opened my mouth, with my voice luring out the voice of the god": grand expressions for breaking off and commencing speech. *premo ora*, literally 'be silent, suppress (one's voice)', is predominantly found in epic; cf. e.g. *Met.* 9.764 *pressit ab his vocem*, Verg. *A.* 6.155 *pressoque obmutuit ore*, Sil. 2.280, Stat. *Theb.* 1.493, *OLD* s.v. 21, *Thes.* 9.2.1079.3ff. *resolvo* (*ora*) often anticipates an utterance of some importance, usually prophetic; cf. 6.249 (Ovid to Vesta), *Met.* 13.126 (Odysseus), Verg. *G.* 4.452 (Proteus), *A.* 3.457 (Sibyl), *Thes.* 9.2. 1079.18–20.

elicio can be used in the metaphorical sense of encouraging someone to speak (*Thes.* 5.2.368.47ff.); but the verb is more commonly used to describe a powerful individual's ability to entice the divine; cf. 3.327–8 *eliciunt caelo te, Iuppiter; unde minores/nunc quoque te celebrant Eliciumque vocant*, Hor. *S.* 1.8.29 (witches), Tib. 1.2.48 (witch), Luc. 6.733, *OLD* s.v. 2b, *Thes.* 5.2.366.56ff. As such, the phraseology suggests a more confident manner of questioning on the part of Ovid; for Ovid's increasing confidence during the conversation, see 227–8n. The close proximity of *voce* ... *voces* plays on the difference between the poet's one mouth and the god's two mouths; for similar play on the duality of Janus' form, see 66n.

257–8 "Why, though there are so many arches, do you stand consecrated in only one of them, here where you have a temple joined to two forums?": there were many arches (*iani*) in Rome, which were widely believed to have taken their name from Janus and were, as with all entrances, naturally thought to have come under the protection of the god; cf. Cic. *N.D.* 2.67 *Ianum* ... *ex quo transitiones perviae iani foresque in liminibus profanarum aedium ianuae nominantur*; Platner/Ashby 275–7; Holland (1961) 26–8, 41ff. In spite of this, it was only in one of the arches that Janus was officially honoured, and this is widely believed to have been the temple of Janus Geminus (also known as Janus Quirinus); for an alternative identification of the temple, see Holland (1961) 92–107. Procopius (5.25.19–22) describes it as a small rectangular structure made of bronze; it had side walls and double doors at each end; as Ovid's phraseology suggests (*stas sacratus*), it

contained a statue of the deity; for discussions, see Platner/Ashby 278–80, Steinby III.92–3. The temple was situated near the point where the Argiletum entered the Forum Romanum close to the curia; in effect, as Ovid suggests in 258, it could be viewed as a corridor joining two forums, Romanum and Iulium; see L. Richardson (1978), "The Curia Julia and the Janus Geminus", *MDAI(R)* 85, 367.

258 hic ubi: for the mimetic approach to topography, see 243–4n.

259–76 Janus responds to Ovid's enquiry by offering a mythological explanation for his temple. During the Sabine conflict in the time of Romulus, the treacherous Tarpeia had led the enemy army secretly to the Roman citadel (259–62) and Juno had opened the gate for them (263–6). Sensing the danger, Janus intervened by opening up nearby fountains; their boiling waters prevented the Sabines from advancing and forced them to withdraw (267–74). As a mark of gratitude to the god, some type of structure was set up for him in the vicinity (275 with n.).

Janus' narrative appears to amalgamate two separate myths. The first is the story of Tarpeia, who famously betrayed the citadel of Rome to the Sabines in exchange for the enemies' golden armlets; cf. Liv. 1.11.6–9 with Ogilvie ad loc.; Prop. 4.4 (though Tarpeia is principally motivated by infatuation for the enemy leader); Dion. Hal. 2.38–40 (listing Fabius Pictor and Cincius Alimentus among his sources); V. Max. 9.6.1; Plu. *Rom.* 17. The second myth, found first in Ovid (cf. *Met.* 14.775–99), involves the repulsion of the Sabines from the citadel of Rome by a sudden eruption of boiling water; for later versions, cf. Macr. 1.9.17–18, Serv. *A.* 1.291, 8.361. This myth may serve the additional purpose of explaining the existence of the hot springs, located close to the temple of Janus Geminus/Quirinus, known as the *Lautolae*; cf. Var. *L.* 5.156 *Lautolae: ab lavando, quod ibi ad Ianum Geminum aquae caldae fuerunt*; Fest. 105 L.; Serv. *A.* 8.361; Platner/Ashby 316; Porte (1985) 170–3; Steinby III.186. Ovid is the first and only extant writer to combine the two myths—both here and at *Met.* 14.775–99—by making the incident with the boiling water a direct response to Tarpeia's treachery.

Critical attention has long been centred on the generically self-conscious manner in which the two Ovidian versions are told in *Met.* and *Fasti*; see in general Heinze (1919) 35–7; Barchiesi (1991) 15–16, (1997) 20–1; Merli (2000) 193–6. Heinze famously noted that, whereas the version in *Met.* contains traditional 'epic' features (for example,

a conflict between Juno and Venus and extensive battle narrative), the version in *Fasti* is distinctly 'elegiac' in its avoidance of elements of warfare. Indeed, in the version in *Fasti*, there is no mention of a battle between Romans and Sabines; no sign of casualties (the Sabines are simply repelled [*pulsis* . . . *Sabinis* (273)]); even Tarpeia's death is brushed over (261–2). Others have detected more subtle generic keys in the episode; see 261nn. (*levis*, *armillis*).

Genre is indeed a useful way of accounting for some of the differences between the two versions of the story in *Met.* and *Fasti*. However, the nature of the story in *Fasti* is also determined by more immediate concerns, such as the character of the primary narrator, the needs of the questioner and the time delay between event and recollection. As a deity who shuns warfare and maintains peace (253), it is fitting that Janus should narrate the story and deal with the Sabines in a bloodless manner. It is also fitting that, as celestial door-keeper (133–44n.), he should explain the help he offered the Romans in terms of 'opening' and 'closing' (272n.). As he is answering a specific enquiry of Ovid's, it is natural for him to focus on the crucial moment of divine intervention which warranted the dedication of his temple, rather than offer a linear narrative of the event: pluperfects take us up to the crucial moment of divine action in 267–72 (cf. *contigerat* (265), *dempserat* (266)). Finally, as Janus is recalling a distant event, in the full knowledge of a successful outcome, he can tell the story in a more relaxed and light-hearted fashion, aggrandising his own power and intuition; see 268n., 269n.

259 manu mulcens propexam ad pectora barbam: Janus' long beard is a prominent feature of the deity represented on coins (see 229–54n.). *propexus* ('combed forward') is a rare and grand adjective. First found in Accius (*Bacch.* fr. 255 Ribbeck), it is used by Vergil to describe the aged Mezentius, in a line which Ovid clearly has in mind here; cf. Verg. *A.* 10.837–8 *ipse aeger anhelans/colla fouet fusus propexam in pectore barbam.* It is later found predominantly in epic in similar expressions of old age, sometimes, as here, involving the play on sounds in *pexus/pectora*; cf. Stat. *Theb.* 2.97–8 *propexaque mento/canities* (the guise of Tiresias), Sil. 13.310 *propexis in pectora barbis.* The highlighting of Janus' mannerism here is an effective way of enlivening the dialogue; see 177n.

260 Oebalii: a learned epithet for the Sabine leader, Tatius, with a complex history. Oebalus was reputed to have been an ancient

king of Sparta; as such, the adjective *Oebalius* is readily used of his descendants, e.g. his son Hyacinthus (*Met.* 10.196) or his granddaughter Helen (*Her.* 16.128, *Rem.* 458). From here, it takes the more general sense 'Spartan'; cf. Verg. *G.* 4.125 *Oebaliae . . . arcis* (Tarentum, a colony of Sparta), Stat. *Theb.* 2.164. Then, by drawing on the popular tradition that the Sabines were descended from the Spartans (cf. Cato *Orig.* fr. 51 Peter, Dion. Hal. 2.49.4, Plu. *Rom.* 16.1), Ovid is the first to extend usage of the adjective to refer to the Sabines; cf. 3.230 *Oebaliae matres* (Sabine wives of Romans).

arma: see 261n.

261 levis custos: the context makes it clear that this is a reference to Tarpeia; for the traditional accounts, see 259–76n. Taken literally, Ovid is adopting a tradition whereby Tarpeia is guardian of the Roman citadel; cf. possibly Prop. 4.4.94 *o vigil* (this may refer to Tarpeia). The more popular tradition has Tarpeia's father, Spurius Tarpeius, as guardian; cf. Liv. 1.11.6, Dion. Hal. 2.38.2, V. Max. 9.6.1, esp. Plu. *Rom.* 17.2 (those who believe that Tarpeia was the guardian accuse Romulus of being a simpleton).

levis can readily be translated 'fickle, unreliable'; cf. *Pont.* 4.3.31, Pl. *Men.* 488, Cic. *Att.* 1.19.11, *OLD* s.v. 15, *Thes.* 7.2.1208.42ff. However, in discussions of genre, *levis* is a key term to describe the 'light' tone and subject-matter of elegy when compared to more serious, 'weightier' genres such as epic; cf. e.g. *Am.* 2.1.21; 3.1.41–2 *sum levis, et mecum levis est, mea cura, Cupido;/non sum materia fortior ipsa mea* (Elegy speaking); *Tr.* 2.327–40; Hinds (1987) 21ff., 141 n.58. Read generically, Tarpeia can be regarded as an ideal candidate for inclusion within an elegiac poem; see Barchiesi (1997) 21.

armillis capta: i.e. captivated with desire for the armour (see 259–76n.). The golden Sabine 'bracelets' are often described as *armillae*; cf. *Am.* 1.10.49, Liv. 1.11.8, V. Max. 9.6.1. However, given the close proximity of *arma* (260) and the generically-loaded nature of the story, there may be a wider significance to *armillae.* In 260, we are led to expect a story involving *arma,* the standard subject-matter of epic traditionally unsuitable for elegy and for this poem particularly (see 13–14n.). By the following line, *arma* have been 'reduced' to *armillae* (diminutive). Read generically, one can view *armillae* as a compromise, a way of accommodating the subject-matter within elegy; see Barchiesi (1991) 15, (1997) 20–1. However, despite the reduction, *arma* is not totally eliminated, and this is a consistent trend in the poem; see 13–14n.

262 ad summae . . . arcis iter "on to the road which led to the top of the citadel": *iter* is here 'road/route' (*OLD* s.v. 5, 6), and the genitive is typically used to denote destination; cf. e.g. *Met.* 15.227, Verg. *A.* 2.387–8, Prop. 3.7.2, Vitr. 1.5.2 *curandumque maxime videtur . . . uti portarum itinera non sint directa sed scaeva.*

263–4 inde, velut nunc est, . . . arduus in valles et fora clivus erat "from there, just as there is now, there was a steep slope into the valley and the fora": the steep slope to which Janus directs Ovid's attention is the *clivus Capitolinus*, the main approach to the Capitol and its citadel; cf. e.g. Liv. 3.18.7, Dion. Hal. 1.34.4, Plin. *Nat.* 19.23. In Ovid's day, it was a road, where formerly it had been just a path. Janus' train of thought is quite precise here as he plots the potential journey taken by the Sabines. First, we are to infer from 262 that the Sabines have reached the citadel with Tarpeia's aid; hence, Janus starts his description from the citadel at the top of the hill. From here, they would take the road down until it led to a valley between Capitol and citadel (*in valles*), sometimes known as *Inter Duos Lucos*; see Platner/Ashby 283. Continuing on the road downwards, they would reach the foot of the hill at the west corner of the Forum Romanum, from where they could travel across the fora (*et fora* [see textual note below]); see Platner/Ashby 122–3, Steinby I.280–1.

263 per quem descenditis "by which you descend": as Ovid's house was apparently adjacent to the Capitol (*Tr.* 1.3.29–30), Janus accurately plots Ovid's own journey to the Forum; see also 243–4n.

et (U²ς) **fora:** in 263–4 Janus seems to be describing the *actual* route from the Capitol taken by the Sabines prior to his intervention in the fora (presumably close to the site of his future temple). The reading *et* gives a clearer sense of the order of events: the Sabines go down into the valley and then into the fora. The reading *per* (**AMω**) creates asyndeton in the line and gives a much vaguer impression of the order of events; this reading may even have arisen through confusion with *per* in the previous line.

265–6 A jealous Juno, ever bitter towards the Romans, removes the gate's bolts for the Sabines. The scene is reminiscent of Verg. *A.* 7.620–2, where Juno opens the gates of War (Janus' temple), symbolising the start of the war between Trojans and Latins.

265 contigerat: the subject is Tatius (260).

portam: a single gate is also opened by Juno at *Met.* 14.781–2. It is unclear which specific gate (if any) is meant here: it has been

variously explained as the gate to the citadel, a gate in the valley between Capitol and citadel or a gate to the Forum. The gate may even be identified with the so-called *Porta Ianualis* (Var. *L.* 5.165, Macr. 1.9.17), which is itself often identified with the temple of Janus Geminus/Quirinus; for discussions, see Platner/Ashby 278–80, Holland (1961) 112ff., 257ff.

Saturnia: used in the parallel Ovidian version at *Met.* 14.782, the epithet is a clear reference to Juno, protector of the Sabines, who was recognised as daughter of Saturn; cf. e.g. 6.29–30, Hom. *Il.* 5.721. Used first by Ennius as both epithet (*Ann.* fr. 53 Sk.) and substantive (*Ann.* fr. 445 Sk.) for Juno, it is found predominantly in high poetry; cf. e.g. 2.191, 5.235, *Met.* 1.612, 3.271, Verg. *A.* 7.622, Lygd. 3.33 with Navarro Antolín ad loc.

266 invidiosa (**AMω**) usually takes the passive sense 'arousing envy, enviable'. The active sense required here, 'jealous', is rare, with only two other examples from the classical period; cf. *Met.* 15.234, Prop. 2.28.9–10 *illa peraeque/prae se formosis invidiosa dea est* (Venus), *Thes.* 7.2.208.76ff. Juno's traditional jealousy of the Roman race stems from a variety of concerns: the judgment of Paris against her, her husband's ravishing of Ganymede and, most crucially, Rome's destiny to destroy her beloved Carthage; cf. 6.43–6, Verg. *A.* 1.12–33. The less well-attested reading, *insidiosa* (**Uς**), used of Juno at 6.508, would also be perfectly acceptable here.

267–70 Janus, a peaceful deity, fears a battle with a belligerent deity and opts for the less confrontational solution of the boiling water. In doing so, Janus mirrors the thematic priorities of the poem, which similarly purports to avoid *arma*; see 13–14n. In the parallel story in *Met.*, it is Venus, enlisting the help of the local water Nymphs, who causes the water to flow (*Met.* 14.783–9); no instigator is mentioned specifically in Macrobius (1.9.17–18) or Servius (*A.* 1.291), but we may infer Janus' involvement from the fact that the water flows from his temple; see 259–76n.

267 committere . . . pugnam "to engage in battle": for the idiom, cf. 2.723, Quadrig. *Hist.* 96 Peter, Hor. *Carm.* 4.14.15, *Thes.* 3.1909.45ff.

268 ipse meae movi callidus artis opus "I myself cunningly set in motion an operation using my own skill": as Janus is recalling the event in the full knowledge of a successful outcome, he can afford to narrate it in a more light-hearted fashion. Janus' concentration

on his own self (*ipse meae*), as well as the passing self-compliment (*callidus* with n.), amount to the sort of light-hearted boasting that is characteristic of the god; cf. 89–288 (iii) n.

movi . . . opus: though this idiom is found elsewhere to describe the initiating of an operation (cf. 4.820), it is notable that the only previous usages refer specifically to the composition of poetry; cf. Verg. *A.* 7.45 *maius opus moveo*, Ov. *Am.* 3.1.6 *Musa moveret opus*, *Ars* 1.29 *usus opus movet hoc*, *Thes.* 9.2.853.7–8. We may, therefore, be encouraged to make a connection here between Janus and the poet; for other examples, see 89–288 (iv) n.

callidus: an adjective with a comic flavour. It is commonly used of cunning slaves in comedy (cf. e.g. Pl. *Am.* 268, Ter. *Eun.* 1011), adulterous women in mime (*Tr.* 2.500) and, later, the wily elegiac lover (cf. e.g. *Am.* 1.2.6, *Ars* 1.490, Tib. 1.4.76). As such, it fits the mock-pompous context in which it is being used.

269–70 Given the strong symbiotic relationship between Janus and the poem/poet (89–288 (iv) n.), we might be tempted to make a link here between Janus' action and Pegasus' opening of the Hippocrene font on Mount Helicon, traditionally viewed as the source of poetic inspiration; see 24n.

269 oraque . . . fontana: for *os* as the 'mouth' from which water bursts forth to form a fountain, cf. *Met.* 1.281, Verg. *A.* 1.245, Sen. *Nat.* 3.30.4, *Thes.* 9.2.1091.41ff. *fontanus*, an adjective first found in and frequently used by Ovid (4.655, 4.759, 5.435, *Ars* 3.726, *Met.* 14.327, *Pont.* 1.8.46) is subsequently found only in prose; see *Thes.* 6.1.1027.80ff.

qua pollens ope sum "in which capacity I am powerful": another light-hearted boast in passing from Janus; see also 268n. Janus' ability to open the channels of a fountain may be regarded simply as part of his wider control over 'openings' in general; cf. 117–20 with nn. However, as some traditions make Janus the husband of the water nymph Juturna (Arnob. *Adv. Nat.* 3.29) and father of the Tiber (Serv. *A.* 8.330), the god may well have been closely associated with water in antiquity; see Holland (1961) *passim*, esp. 27–8.

270 repentinas: *repentinus* has a distinctly prosaic feel, as it is only elsewhere found in poetry at *Met.* 5.5, *Ciris* 460 and *Dirae* 56 (*OLD* and Lewis/Short s.v.).

eiaculatus: *eiaculor*, first found in Ovid, is used by the poet to describe the graphic spurting forth of liquid from a small cavity; cf. *Met.* 4.124 (water from a burst pipe), 6.259 (blood from an arrow wound). It is later confined to prose (mostly Pliny) where it is used

in a less vivid sense; cf. Plin. *Nat.* 4.73 (casting a shadow), 10.122 (birds taking off), 37.136 (casting a rainbow), *Thes.* 5.2.302.83ff.

271 madidis . . . venis: *vena* is commonly used to denote an underground channel of water; cf. e.g. 3.298, Liv. 44.33.2, Vitr. 8.1.2, *OLD* s.v. 5. *madidus*, usually denoting something merely dampened, takes here the extended sense 'flowing, abounding in liquid'; cf. Stat. *Silv.* 5.5.16, Calp. *Ecl.* 1.2, Plin. *Nat.* 23.63, *OLD* s.v. 4, *Thes.* 8.37.70ff.

subieci: the verb (lit. 'throw in/under') complements *eiaculatus* (270).

sulpura: as in *Met.* 14.791, the water is heated using sulphur. Its capacity for burning is evidenced by its popular usage in purification ceremonies; cf. e.g. *Met.* 7.261, Tib. 1.5.11–12 with Murgatroyd ad loc., Prop. 4.8.86.

272 clauderet: cf. *reclusi* (269). Fittingly for the celestial doorkeeper, Janus describes his action in terms of 'opening' and 'closing'; for the later use of the same verbs when referring to temple doors, cf. *recluderis* (277), *clausus ero* (282).

273–4 "When the advantage of this course of action had been made clear—now that the Sabines had been repelled—the location, safe again, returned to its former shape".

273 utilitas, 'usefulness, advantage', although used sixteen times by Ovid, was evidently considered unpoetic, as it is only elsewhere found in Augustan poetry at Hor. *S.* 1.3.98; see Janka on *Ars* 2.293.

pulsis . . . Sabinis: the phrase underplays the bloodshed involved in the routing of the Sabines; it may even suggest that the rout was both straightforward and unbloody. In other versions, battle ensues between Romans and Sabines, with many casualties on each side; cf. *Met.* 14.799–804, Macr. 1.9.18. Janus' omission of warfare and bloodshed suits both his peaceful character and the nature of the poem itself; see 259–76n.

275 ara mihi posita est parvo coniuncta sacello: a problematic line. We could intepret it as meaning that *two* edifices were set up to honour Janus, an altar and a shrine; the logical conclusion would be that, prior to his intervention, Janus had no local edifice dedicated to him. But this would contradict the other accounts of the story, which suggest that some sort of shrine to Janus existed beforehand: a shrine to Janus is alluded to in the story in *Met.* (14.785); in both Macrobius (1.9.17–18) and Servius (*A.* 1.291), it is from Janus' shrine that the boiling water is supposed to have erupted. For this reason, we would be equally justified in translating 275 as

'an altar was set up for me, joined to my (existing) small shrine'.

Whichever of the two meanings we adopt, we face further problems. If Janus is referring to the temple of Janus Geminus/Quirinus (see 257–8n.), *ara* and/or *sacellum* are curious terms to use (cf. 258 *templa*). What exactly *ara* refers to may always remain a mystery. As for *parvo . . . sacello*, there may be a specific (moralistic) reason to justify Janus' lexical choice: it concurs with his earlier moralistic sentiment that early Rome built humble sanctuaries for its gods (201–2).

276 adolet: the verb is primarily used in the religious context to denote sacrificial burning on an altar; cf. 3.803 *viscera qui tauri flammis adolenda dedisset*, *Met.* 8.740, Lucr. 4.1237, Verg. *A.* 1.704, 3.547, *Thes.* 1.793.51ff.

cum strue farra: for the traditional sacrificial offering of emmer wheat (*far*), see 337–8n. The *strues* was a special sacrificial cake, exclusively offered to Janus, which apparently resembled human fingers in shape; cf. Cato *Agr.* 134.2, Fest. 408 L., Holland (1961) 271–4; see also 127–8n.

277 'at cur pace lates, motis recluderis armis?' "But why, in peacetime, are you hiding, and why are you opened when arms have been taken up?": in asking why Janus' temple is closed during peacetime and opened during war, Ovid identifies Janus both as the resident god hiding (*lates*) in his temple, and as a personification of the temple itself (*recluderis*). Janus will likewise reply by referring to himself at one time as the doorkeeper for the temple (*fores obdo* [281]) and at another as the temple itself (*clausus ero* [282]).

The reason for the custom of opening and closing the temple was not manifest (see 279–82n.); hence it is a reasonable question for Ovid to put to the god. However, Ovid's enquiry becomes more poignant if one considers it in the light of his former experiences as elegiac lover. Addressing his lover's *ianitor* in *Am.* 1.6, Ovid had in fact argued that her doors should be opened precisely because it *was* peaceful, and that closed doors were only suitable in time of war; cf. *Am.* 1.6.27–30 *ianitor, audis/roboribus duris ianua fulta riget./urbibus obsessis clausae munimina portae/prosunt; in media pace quid arma times?*, 33 *non ego militibus venio comitatus et armis.* In light of this logic, it is perhaps natural for Ovid to register his surprise when the reverse occurs.

motisque . . . armis: for the idiom, cf. e.g. 5.38 *in magnos arma movete deos*, *Am.* 1.9.26, *Met.* 5.197, Verg. *A.* 8.565, Tac. *Ann.* 12.52, *Thes.* 2.596.60–1, 597.2ff.

278 nec mora: though not uncommon in elegy, this phrase—

usually, as here, found with asyndeton—is particularly at home in high poetry, especially epic; cf. e.g. *Am.* 1.6.13 with McKeown ad loc., *Ars* 3.709, Verg. *A.* 5.458, 12.553, *Thes.* 8.1471.33ff.

quaesiti reddita causa mihi est "the reason behind the issue for which I had asked was given to me": Lewis/Short suggest (s.v. *quaero*, C) that this is a rare poetic use of a noun *quaesitum* to mean 'question'. But Ovid's use of similar phraseology elsewhere suggests that *quaesiti* here is strictly past participle ('thing sought'); cf. 115 *accipe quaesitae quae causa sit altera formae*, 4.246 *reddita quaesiti causa furoris erat*, *Met.* 4.793–4. For the idiom *causam reddo*, cf. 6.415, *Am.* 2.2.7 *quaerenti reddita causa est*, Cic. *Off.* 1.101, Hor. *S.* 1.4.116, *Thes.* 3.668.25ff.

279–82 Janus offers a reason for the custom of opening his temple during warfare and closing it during peacetime. These lines have generated much interest and confusion.

Lines 279–80 are straightforward enough. Janus suggests that his doors are open in times of war so that the people/army (see 279 *populo* n.) who have set out to war may be able to return. This explanation is later entertained by Servius; cf. Serv. *A.* 1.291 *est alia melior ratio, quod ad proelium ituri optent reversionem*, 1.294 *ideo autem Ianus belli tempore patefiebat, ut eiusdem conspectus per bellum pateret, in cuius potestate esset exitus reditusque.* In effect, Janus invites us to view his temple symbolically as the precincts from which the Roman army sets out to war, and to which it returns after the campaign. This symbolism may have been influenced by Roman military practice, since Roman soldiers were believed to have marched to and from war through an arch (*ianus*); see Versnel (1970) 132ff., esp. 139–40, 161–2.

Line 281 has proven problematic for scholars, who have unanimously understood *pax* as the implied subject of *possit*; as such, they are faced with a direct contradiction on the part of Janus which requires explanation—here, his closed doors are said to keep *Peace* contained (281); earlier, he told us that they keep *Wars* contained (123–4). In fact, the implied subject of *possit* should be *populus* (following on from *populo* (279)), creating a logical train of thought from the previous couplet: Janus closes his doors in peace to prevent the army, having returned, from leaving again; for detailed discussion, see Green (2000).

Janus has therefore offered two different explanations for the custom of opening and closing his temple: one in grand, personified terms of the imprisonment of *Bella* (121–4), the other in more mundane

terms of soldiers setting out to and returning from war (279–82). There may even be an allusion to a third explanation, involving a connection with the previous story of Janus' opening of the fountain; see Green (2000) 308 n. 16.

279 populo: though 'people' is an adequate translation, the specialised meaning 'infantry/army' might be more appropriate: this sense is detectable in titles such as *magister populi* 'master of the infantry' (cf. e.g. Cic. *Rep.* 1.63, Var. *L.* 5.82) and the military verb *populor*; see Cornell (1995) 257 n. 60.

281 obdo, literally 'place as a barrier', regularly comes to mean 'close'; cf. e.g. *Pont.* 2.2.40, Pl. *Cas.* 891 *forem obdo*, Ter. *Haut.* 278, Apul. *Met.* 5.9, *Thes.* 9.2.37.15ff.

qua "in any way/by any route": cf. 2.854, Verg. *A.* 1.682, Liv. 6.2.9 *ne qua intrare ad munimenta hostis posset*, *OLD* s.v. 7, 9.

282 Caesareoque diu numine clausus ero "and, under the godhead of (a) Caesar, I will remain closed for a long time": in light of the forthcoming pronouncement of a triumph for Germanicus (285–6), it is likely that *Caesareo . . . numine* is a complimentary allusion to the young prince. However, the phrase is general enough to be applicable to any or all of the imperial family; cf. *Tr.* 5.3.46 (Augustus), 5.11.20 *Caesareum numen sic mihi mite fuit* (Augustus), and later *Laus Pis.* 71 (Nero), Calp. *Ecl.* 4.132 (Nero).

It is, at first, surprising to learn that Janus makes no reference to any *specific* occasions on which his temple was closed, despite Augustus' famous boast to have closed the temple three times during his reign (*RG* 13). However, there appears to be no ancient consensus as to how often, on what occasions and by whom the temple was closed; see Herbert-Brown (1994) 185–94. This apparent confusion might explain why Ovid avoids the issue entirely, opting instead for flattery in terms of the *length* of peacetime which Rome will enjoy.

This, the last sentiment uttered by Janus, concludes the section fittingly on a peaceful note. It creates a neat ring structure to the episode: what started with Janus being asked to open the temples (70) finishes with Janus promising to keep his doors closed; see Hardie (1991) 53.

Caesareoque: *Caesareus*, first found in Ovid, is used fifteen times by the poet (eleven in the exile poetry); cf. *Met.* 1.201 (Julius Caesar), *Met.* 15.864 (Augustus), *Pont.* 1.1.27; see also 282n.

283–4 Janus' special ability to survey all parts of the world simultaneously (cf. 139–40, 143–4) enables him to be the first to announce to the poet a victory for his patron Germanicus (see 285–6n.).

283 diversa "in different directions": though the idiom is found elsewhere without a preposition (cf. Apul. *Met.* 2.29 *populus aestuat diversa tendentes*), it is usually constructed with *in*; cf. Verg. *A.* 8.642–3 *haud procul inde citae Mettum in diuersa quadrigae/distulerant*, Stat. *Theb.* 1.135, Plin. *Nat.* 27.124, *Thes.* 5.1.1586.9ff.

285–6 "There was peace, and the Rhine, the source of your (family's) triumph, Germanicus, had already handed over to you its waters as slaves": Germanicus' triumph over the German tribes was finally celebrated on 26th May, A.D. 17; cf. Tac. *Ann.* 2.41.2. It is possible that Ovid is referring to this, but unlikely: Ovid is now generally thought to have died in early A.D. 17 (see Introduction, II); this would make Germanicus' actual triumph too late for inclusion within the poem. It is more likely that Ovid is alluding to a decree of the Senate, made on 1st January, A.D. 15, awarding Germanicus the triumph while the war was still in progress; cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.55.1 *decernitur Germanico triumphus, manente bello.* First, news of this decree could easily have reached the exiled poet before his death. Secondly, Ovid's decision to mention the triumph during his dealings with 1st January points neatly to the senatorial decree of the same date.

From Ovid's viewpoint, Germanicus' actual victory must now have seemed imminent enough to warrant the present flattery. In effect, Ovid is fulfilling a pledge, made in the exile poetry, to honour the military achievements of the young prince; cf. *Pont.* 2.1.57ff., 4.8.31–4 *Germanice . . . Naso, suis opibus, carmine gratus erit*, 65–6.

285 vestri, Germanice, causa triumphi: the juxtaposition of *vestri* with a singular addressee might suggest that this is a very rare example of *vester* equivalent to *tuus*; for other apparent examples, cf. *Am.* 2.16.24 with McKeown ad loc., Cat. 39.20 *ut quo iste vester expolitior dens est* (Egnatius), 99.6, Sen. *Her. O.* 1513. But there may be a particular point to the switch in person between *vestri* and *tibi* (286): it might subtly promote the idea that an achievement for one member of the imperial family (*tibi*, Germanicus) ennobles the whole family (*vestri*); for an earlier articulation of the sentiment, cf. 9–12; see also 701n.

286 tradiderat famulas iam tibi Rhenus aquas: it was a favourite tactic of Ovid's (especially in the exile poetry) to present military victory by personifying the subjugated region; cf. 645–6 with n., *Tr.* 3.12.47–8 *teque, rebellatrix, tandem, Germania, magni/triste caput pedibus supposuisse ducis*, 4.2.1–2, 43–6, *Pont.* 2.8.39–40, 3.4.107–8 *squalidus immissos fracta sub harundine crines/Rhenus et infectas sanguine portet*

aquas. This may have been influenced by Roman triumphs, as 'models' of subjugated cities/rivers regularly formed part of the procession; cf. e.g. *Ars* 1.219–20 *atque aliqua ex illis cum regum nomina quaeret,/quae loca, qui montes, quaeve ferantur aquae* with Hollis ad loc., Cic. *Pis.* 60, Tib. 2.5.116; *RE* 7A.1.502.61ff.

Though the general motif is common in Ovid, the particular imagery employed here is striking. *famulus* is an elevated term for 'slave'; see P. Watson (1985), "Axelson Revisited: The Selection of Vocabulary in Latin Poetry", *CQ* 35, 434–6. It is here used metaphorically to describe the waters of the Rhine which have now been 'handed over' to their new master; for the metaphorical usage of *famulus*, cf. *Pont.* 2.2.78, Pomp. Atell. 107, Sil. 3.138–9 *an Romana iuga et famulas Carthaginis arces/perpetiar?*, *Thes.* 6.1.269.38ff. This powerful image of the 'slave' river clearly influenced later writers; cf. Mart. 5.3.1–2 *accola iam nostrae Degis, Germanice, ripae/a famulis Histri qui tibi venit aquis*, 9.1.3–4, Rut. Nam. 1.152.

287–8 In a similar fashion to his opening prayer to the god (65–70), Ovid concludes by praying to Janus that he safeguard peace and those who uphold it; for similar end prayers for long life for a particular institution and the imperial household, cf. 721–2 with n. (priests at the Ara Pacis), 3.426–8 (to Vesta), 4.953–4.

287 fac aeternos pacem pacisque ministros: use of the plural (*ministros*) incorporates the entire imperial family. Strictly speaking, *pacem* and *ministros* require different senses of *fac aeternos*: "Make peace eternal and ensure long-life to the ministers of peace". This is the closest that Ovid comes to zeugma; cf. (possibly) *Met.* 7.348–9 *plura locuturo cum verbis guttura Colchis/abstulit*, Knox (1995) 30 n. 77; for Ovid's preference for syllepsis, see 597n.

288 neve suum praesta deserat auctor opus "and bring (your aid) to bear lest the author abandon his work": the general nature of *auctor* and *opus* allows for two different interpretations. Following on from 285–7, the *auctor* ('instigator') could be taken as Germanicus and his *opus* the maintenance of peace. However, the phraseology equally encourages us to read the *auctor* as the poet and the *opus* as his poem. Comparison can be drawn with Ovid's final plea to Flora at 5.377–8: *floreat ut toto carmen Nasonis in aevo,/sparge, precor, donis pectora nostra tuis.* Just as he calls upon Flora to transfer to the poetic sphere her power of bringing things to bloom, so Ovid may be calling upon the god of beginnings to grant peaceful course to the poem in its early stages.

praesta: the verb is elsewhere used in Roman prayer to ask for

divine favour; cf. e.g. 3.497–8 *Bacche, fidem praesta, nec praefer amoribus ullam/coniugis*, *Prec. Terr.* 3, 21, 24 *diva mihi praesta volens*, 31, 32, *Prec. Herb.* 11, 13.

289 quod tamen ex ipsis licuit mihi discere fastis "but now for what I have been able to learn from the calendars themselves": Ovid suddenly reverts to the role of earnest researcher by claiming to consult the calendars; for similar claims, see 657n. As such, he is fulfilling his earlier promise to use official forms of documentation as a source for the poem (7–12). If Ovid does have any particular *fasti* in mind here, they are the *Fasti Antiates Maiores* or *Fasti Praenestini*, both of which mention the two temples in question—Aesculapius and Ve(d)iovis (291–4)—under 1st January; cf. *Fasti Antiates Maiores* (Degrassi 2) *f(astus) Aescula(pio) Co(r)o(nidi), Vediove, Fasti Praenestini* (Degrassi 111) *(fastus Aescu)lapio Vediovi in Insula.* The *Fasti Praenestini* might be the most important source given that its entry, like Ovid's, emphasises the temples' shared location on the Tiber Island (293–4). That said, the abbreviated comment in the calendars only acts as a starting-point for Ovid, who gives his treatment of the temples poetic colouring and even fresh imperial significance; see, in general, Miller (2002) 173–4, Green (2004) 229–30.

Even though Ovid is now fulfilling his earlier pledge to consult calendars, a huge discrepancy in Ovid's treatment of 1st January cannot escape our notice: his 'research' of the calendars yields only five lines (290–4), compared to the 200-line conversation with Janus (89–288). At the start of his poem, therefore, Ovid subtly bears witness both to the limitations of the official calendars as a source (see Introduction, I)—note the force of *licuit*—and to his own intention to 'research' and present material in more varied, playful ways.

290 patres: in the Republican period, before the curtailment of their powers under Augustus, the dedication of temples was the responsibility of the senate and magistrates; see BNP I.29–30, 196–7.

291–2 "The island, which the river touches with its forked water, received the son born to Phoebus and the nymph Coronis": a complex, poetic reference to the temple of Aesculapius on the Tiber Island. The healing-god Aesculapius was awarded a temple on the Island (1st January, c. 290 B.C.) as a mark of gratitude for the help he offered the Romans in the event of a serious plague; for the miraculous story, cf. *Met.* 15.622–744, Liv. 10.47.7, *Per.* 11, Plu. *Mor.* 286d–e; for the temple, see Platner/Ashby 2–3, Steinby I.21–2. In

referring to Aesculapius by the grand formula *Phoebo nymphaque Coronide natum*, Ovid downplays the remarkable nature of Aesculapius' birth. Before giving birth to her son, Coronis was sentenced to death for having an adulterous affair with another man; the unborn baby was snatched from the womb before the mother was committed to the pyre; cf. *Met.* 2.596–632, Pind. *Pyth.* 3.8–81, Hyg. *Fab.* 202, Apollod. 3.10.3, Paus. 2.26.7.

292 dividua: for the rare, poetic use of *dividuus* to refer to the 'forking' of waters (around land), cf. Luc. 8.465, Rut. Nam. 1.179–180 *qua fronte bicorni/dividuus Tiberis dexteriora secat*, *Thes.* 5.1.1611.80ff.

293 Iuppiter in parte est "Jupiter has a share of this": an allusive reference to the temple of Ve(d)iovis, which also stood on the Tiber Island. The temple was dedicated by C. Servilius on 1st January, 194 B.C., fulfilling an vow that L. Furius Purpurio had made six years earlier. Though the official *fasti* confirm the name Ve(d)iovis (see 289n.), the temple is elsewhere associated, as here, with Jupiter; cf. Liv. 34.53.7, Vitr. 3.2.3. This reflects a popular connection/confusion between the deities; cf. 3.429–38 (Ovid identifies Vediovis as the 'young Jupiter'), Briscoe on Liv. 31.21.12, Steinby V.101. For the idiom *in parte esse* 'to have a share in', cf. *Am.* 2.16.14, *Ars* 1.566, *Tr.* 5.14.9 *nostrorum cum sis in parte malorum*, Liv. 5.46.4, *Thes.* 10.1.463.12ff.

293–4 cepit locus unus utrumque/iunctaque sunt magno templa nepotis avo "one place took them both and the temple of the grandson was joined to his great grandfather": though the two temples were dedicated for different reasons, to different gods and at different times, Ovid is able to link them harmoniously by making use of the traditional lineage of Jupiter as grandfather of Aesculapius through Apollo (cf. e.g. *Met.* 1.517, 15.638–9): Ovid articulates the events in terms of a divine family reunion (mirrored by the juxtaposition of *nepotis avo*). On one level, this demonstrates Ovid's mastery over his material and willingness to present it in a more artistic way than it was presented in the calendars. However, there may also be a political dimension to this sentiment, if we take into account the immediate addressee Germanicus. The generalised nature of *nepotis avo* might encourage the young prince to understand the sentiment as equally applicable to himself, and to look forward to the day when he will share the same honour as his own *magnus avus*, Augustus; for full discussion, see Green (2004) 229–30.

The harmony that exists here between Aesculapius and Jupiter

marks a strong contrast to a story towards the end of Book 6 (733–62), in which Jupiter kills Aesculapius for his healing abilities before deifying him; for the dynamics of this story, see Newlands (1995) 192–7; for the 'negative mirroring' of stories in Books 1 and 6, see 391–440 (ii) n.

295–310 Eulogy to Astronomers

Ahead of the first astronomical observation of the poem (311–14), Ovid constructs a respectful eulogy to the intellect of the first stargazers. After a reminder of his earlier pledge (2) to include astronomical material in the poem (295–6), Ovid starts the eulogy proper with a general praise of astronomers' intellectual superiority over ordinary men (297–300). In 301–4, Ovid details all the earthly distractions that astronomers shun, before outlining their own more heavenly pursuit (305–6). The poet then endorses astronomy (307–8) and promises to follow the path that these pioneers have set out (309–10).

This eulogy is intriguing, in terms of both its particular details and its place in the context of the poem as a whole, and poses a number of questions; for general discussions of this eulogy, see Newlands (1995) 32–43, Barchiesi (1997) 178–80, Gee (2000) 47–65, Herbert-Brown (2002) 101–28.

i. *Who are the* felices animae *(297)?*

The most obvious and pressing issue is the specific identity of the 'happy (stargazing) souls' whom Ovid praises. What clues are given? The most useful piece of information occurs in 301–4, where Ovid insists that these enlightened individuals shun careers in politics and the military: this would seem to rule out any prominent Roman, and certainly the imperial family, for whom such careers were the norm. But we are given no more positive direction than this.

Many modern scholars suggest that the individuals to whom Ovid refers are not astronomers as such but writers of astronomical poetry, particularly within the didactic tradition, an interpretation apparently reinforced by the density of allusion to and intertext with those poets within the eulogy itself. The major purpose of the preface would be, therefore, to articulate the generic affiliations *Fasti* has in its dealing

with the stars; see Newlands (1995) 32–43, Gee (2000) 47–65. It is certainly the case that Ovid's eulogy owes much to didactic predecessors, especially Vergil's praise of farmers and philosophers (*G.* 2.458–540 esp. 490ff.), Lucretius' praise of Epicurus and philosophers in general (1.62–79, 2.1–61) and, through these two, Aratus as well; see nn. They might well be fitting candidates for the *duces* (309) that Ovid intends to follow in this poem.

More recently, Herbert-Brown [(2002) 121–8] has put forward an interesting case for identifying the 'happy souls' as *astrologers.* The status of these (often foreign) individuals was elevated in Rome not by the standard Roman forms of advancement (hence the comments in 301–4), but because they were playing an increasingly prominent (and controversial) role in the maintenance of imperial power; see esp. Barton (1994) 33–47, Herbert-Brown (2002) 113–21. The suggestion is that Ovid's original (pre-exilic) intention was to provide a respectful eulogy to astrologers so as to endow the controversial issue with a certain sense of dignity and antiquity; this eulogy was then to act as a fitting prelude to astrological material elsewhere in the poem. However, following the Augustan edict of A.D. 11 which put a ban on consulting astrologers outside the imperial circle, *Fasti*'s astrological content was rendered politically volatile; Ovid was therefore forced to excise material, and the eulogy as we have it shows signs of such revision; see 310n., also 651n.

Both theories should be given careful consideration here: the elusive nature of Ovid's eulogy seems designed to allow for several potential identities for the *felices animae.*

ii. *How well does the eulogy fit the context of the poem as a whole?*

In the light of the rest of the poem, Ovid's eulogy in 295–310 may seem to be jarring in many respects; see, in general, Newlands (1995) 32, 40–1, Barchiesi (1997) 178–80, Herbert-Brown (2002) 104–9.

First, the preface concentrates on the intellectual value of a study of the stars and the ways in which it allows a closer association with the divine (297–300, 305–6). This is at odds with much of the astronomical content of the poem, which instead endorses mythical, anthropomorphic interpretation of stars; for the star myths in *Fasti*, see 311–14 (ii) n. This pattern is similar to *Metamorphoses*, where, in the reverse order, the intermittent anthropomorphic stellar myths of Books

1–14 are met, at the end of the epic, with a philosophical interpretation of metamorphosis by Pythagoras (15.60–478). Either this preface is deliberately deceptive, or else any 'intellectual' stellar content was removed at a later stage (see Herbert-Brown (2002) above).

Secondly, and perhaps more worryingly, a study of the stars is seen as encoding a set of values quite different from that of the Roman statesman and, particularly, the imperial family (see 301–4nn.); to praise the lifestyle of astronomers might be seen, therefore, to invite a critical look at the key values of Roman civil life. The legal and military skills of Ovid's patron Germanicus, for example, thus far held up for praise (21–2, 285–6 with nn.), are here numbered among the inferior earthly distractions which are shunned by the wise scientist (301–2n.). Furthermore, Ovid's suggestion that heaven can be reached only through a study of the stars might be read as a criticism against the much-vaunted apotheoses of imperial members (307–8 with nn.). However we deal with these apparent tensions, the eulogy helps to foreshadow later tensions between the Roman world and the world of the stars; see 311–14 (iii) n.

295 quid vetat: the MSS are split between *quid vetat* (**Uς**) and *quis vetat* (**AMω**)—a common problem (see Luck on *Tr.* 1.2.11)—and it is impossible to choose between the readings here. The guarded nature of this opening is symptomatic of the fact that astronomical material did not usually form part of the official *fasti*; see 311–14 (i) n. It is also another instance of the poem's concern with the appropriate time for speech (296 *dicere*); see 445n.

oriturque caditque: the sentiment picks up the second line of the poem (*lapsaque . . . ortaque signa*) and recalls the original pledge.

296 promissi pars sit et ista mei "let that also be part of my pledge": given that Ovid has already stated his intent to deal with the rising and setting of stars (2), the present subjunctive (*sit* (**AUς**)) is a more difficult reading than *fuit* (**Mhς**). However, it seems entirely appropriate for Ovid to offer an exhortatory reaffirming of his intent at the beginning of his introduction to the subject proper.

297 felices animae, quibus haec cognoscere primis: for the problems in identifying the *felices animae*, see 295–310 (i) n. The line is clearly modelled on the opening to Vergil's praise of philosophers in *Georgics*, thus immediately establishing generic affiliation with an important predecessor in astronomical poetry; cf. *G.* 2.490 *felix, qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas*, see also 295–310 (i) n.

The eulogistic formula *felix qui*, particularly at home in the language of the mystery cults, was by Ovid's day a popular way of initiating praise; cf. e.g. 540, *Am.* 2.10.29 (the lover), *Met.* 10.329 (birds in love), Hom. *Od.* 5.306, *h. Cer.* 480ff., Hor. *Carm.* 1.13.17 with Nisbet/Hubbard ad loc., Bömer on 297.

298 inque domos superas scandere cura fuit "and whose concern it was to climb into the houses of the gods": Ovid here taps into the popular conceit that intellectual pursuits (notably philosophy and astronomy) enable the student to travel figuratively to the heavens themselves; cf. *Met.* 15.62–3 *isque licet caeli regione remotos/mente deos adiit* (Pythagoras), Lucr. 1.72–7 (Epicurus), Man. 1.40–2, 2.105ff., Sen. *Dial.* 12.8.6, [Sen.] *Oct.* 385–90, *Aetna* 223ff.; L. Delatte (1935), *"Caelum ipsum petimus stultitia"*, *Ant. Class.* 4, 325–35; Volk (2001) 88–92.

Ovid's phraseology is, however, particularly vivid, suggesting a physical ascent into the abodes of the gods themselves; cf. Hor. *Carm.* 1.28.5 *aerias temptasse domos* (the pursuits of the Pythagorean Archytas). By such phraseology, the astronomers' pursuit becomes reminiscent of the physical onslaught on heaven conducted by the Giants, who piled up mountains in order to climb their way to the gods; see 307–8n.

The use of Gigantomachic imagery as a positive metaphor for the pursuits of the scientist is found elsewhere in Lucretius and Manilius; cf. Lucr. 1.68–9 (Epicurus), 5.114–21, Man. 1.95–112, Hardie (1986) 209–13, Volk (2001) 106–14. But Ovid is not consistent with this imagery: in 307–8, he will adopt the more traditional, moralistic approach to the Giants by condemning their action as one far removed from the world of the scientist (see n.).

299–300 The suggestion here that astronomers are above other mortals in both mental outlook and geographical position (*vitiisque locisque*) builds on the popular conceit that intellectuals are closer to the divine; see 298n.

299 credibile est "well might we believe": the phrase in Ovid typically introduces a belief which is well-grounded or based on common sense; cf. 2.238, *Am.* 1.11.11, 3.1.2, *Tr.* 1.9.33–4 *Euryali Nisique fide tibi, Turne, relata/credibile est lacrimis inmaduisse genas*, 2.72, *Pont.* 1.4.48.

vitiisque locisque: for the favourite Ovidian figure of syllepsis, see 597n. The *vitia* in question will be mentioned in 303–4.

300 exseruisse caput: for the metaphorical usage of the phrase to denote superiority, cf. *Epic. Drusi* 45–6 *quid . . . /altius et vitiis exeruisse*

<u>*caput*</u> (Livia), Sen. *Ep.* 21.5, Sil. 1.29–30 (Rome's expansion).

301–4 Ovid attempts to support his statement about the superior nature of astronomers by first listing a series of regular (though inferior) Roman occupations (301–2) and goals in life (303–4) which are all shunned by the astronomer. In doing so, Ovid employs the popular rhetorical device of the priamel, whereby the uniqueness of a particular situation/group is emphasised by means of (negative) foils; for the device, see esp. W. Race (1982), *The Classical Priamel from Homer to Boethius*, Leiden, 7–17. The priamel is particularly common in comparisons of lifestyles—see Hor. *Carm.* 1.1 with Nisbet/Hubbard ad loc.—and is elsewhere employed, as here, to emphasise the special nature of the intellectual; cf. Lucr. 1.68–9 *quem neque fama deum nec fulmina nec minitanti/murmure compressit caelum* (Epicurus does not share the superstition of the masses), 2.1–61 (philosophers), Man. 4.398–407 (astronomers). These lines, however, owe much in general sentiment to Vergil's praise of farmers at *G.* 2.495–512 (see nn.).

301–2 The pursuits assigned to each line of the couplet represent the two traditional polar opposites of occupation for the Roman. *Venus et vinum* (301), a phrase which encapsulates not only love but also love poetry and the life of *otium*, represents the Roman lifestyles which were typically regarded as unmanly and ignoble; careers in politics or the military (302) were, by contrast, considered noble occupations (cf. e.g. Cic. *Off.* 1.71). The tension between these two types of career path is often expressed by the love-poets themselves, who see their lifestyles as incompatible with either a military or political career; cf. e.g. *Am.* 1.15.3–6 with McKeown's introduction, *Tr.* 4.10.15–22, Tib. 1.1.53–6, Prop. 3.5, 4.1.133ff. (Horos' warning).

The implication of these lines is that the astronomer actually stands outside these traditional poles of behaviour for the Roman; whoever is being praised in this eulogy, it would seem to exclude prominent Romans (including the imperial family) for whom military and political careers were expected; see 295–310 (ii) n.

301 Venus et vinum: *Venus* is popular metonymy for sexual passion (397n.), and wine is famous for spurring on such passion. As such, the two are regularly evoked together as catalysts for sexual activity; cf. e.g. 403ff., *Am.* 1.6.59–60 with McKeown ad loc., *Ars* 1.244, Pl. *Aul.* 745, Ter. *Ad.* 470, Prop. 1.3.14 *hac Amor hac Liber, durus uterque deus.*

Despite the influence of Verg. *G.* 2.495–512 in these lines (see 301–4nn.), love and wine are absent from the list of negatives in

the Vergilian priamel. Ovid may be drawing on Lucretius, who likewise suggests that love-making and wine are incompatible with any calm philosophical meditation; cf. e.g. Lucr. 3.476–83, 4.1121–40 with Brown ad loc. The inclusion of these elements may also be intended to intimate the maturation of the poet: though he loved and wrote love poetry in his youth, he now recognises its folly and prepares himself for loftier meditation. This new resolve is best observed when compared to *Am.* 2.10.29—*felix, quem Veneris certamina mutua perdunt*—where the love-struck Ovid had envied the ruin that love can bring; see Newlands (1995) 38–9.

Despite the verbal play here between *Venus* and *vinum*, the ancients appear to have entertained no etymological connection (see Maltby s.v.).

fregit: a strong verb which reflects the former love-poet's awareness of the ruinous effects of love; cf. *Am.* 2.18.4 *et tener ausuros grandia frangit Amor*, Prop. 2.34.34, 3.21.33; cf. also Prop. 1.14.17.

302 officiumque fori militiaeve labor: Ovid follows in more general and categorical fashion the criticism of military and political careers which are particularised at Verg. *G.* 2.495–512; for criticism of political endeavour, cf. Verg. *G.* 2.495–6 *non populi fasces*... *flexit*, 502, 508; for criticism of military campaign, cf. Verg. *G.* 2.497–8, 503–4. For the rare phrase *militiae labor* 'the strife of military service', cf. *Pont.* 1.6.10, Cic. *Fam.* 7.8.1, Curt. 9.3.1, *Thes.* 8.959.68ff.

303 levis ambitio: *ambitio*, the striving for public office, is considered a vice by moralists not so much for its desired outcomes as for the underhand measures employed to achieve them. Ovid's use of *levis* ('fickle') taps into the popular notion that the pursuit of office encourages a man to be deceitful and fickle in his friendships; cf. esp. Sal. *Cat.* 10.5 *ambitio multos mortalis falsos fieri subegit, aliud clausum in pectore, aliud in lingua promptum habere, amicitias inimicitiasque non ex re, sed ex commodo aestumare magisque voltum quam ingenium bonum habere*, also Cic. *Pet.* 42 (Cicero actively encourages such deceit in electioneering). It is a vice beyond not only the intellectual but also, apparently, Ovid himself; cf. *Ars* 3.541 *nec nos ambitio*... *tangit*, *Tr.* 4.10.38.

perfusaque gloria fuco "*gloria* steeped in red dye": the personification of *gloria* here is striking and not done justice by some translators: cf. "glory's tinsel sheen" (Frazer), "false-coated fame" (Boyle/Woodard). It is an intriguingly elusive phrase which allows for several interpretations. In the immediate context of discussion about politics and warfare (302), the phrase could refer to either political or military renown. If *gloria* is taken to refer to renown

earned from victory in warfare (see 714n.), *perfusa . . . fuco* might allude to the practice of smearing the face of the victorious general with red (leaden) paint at his triumph; cf. Plin. *Nat.* 33.111, Serv. *Ecl.* 10.27 *triumphantes qui habent omnia Iovis insignia . . . faciem quoque de rubrica inlinunt*, Isid. *Orig.* 18.2.6, Versnel (1970) 59–60, 78–84. If *gloria* is taken to refer to political renown, *perfusa . . . fuco* might allude to the purple border of the consular toga (81n.): see Nagle "the purple of status".

There is, however, a third possible interpretation, if we take *gloria* in the more specialised sense 'vanity' (see *OLD* s.v. 4, *Thes.* 6.2.2084.59ff.). Ovid might then be personifying vanity (for which, cf. esp. Hor. *Ep.* 1.18.22) as a woman who is wearing too much make-up. *fucus*, the red dye extracted from a seaweed—cf. Plin. *Nat.* 11.154, 13.136, 26.103, André (1956) 142–3 s.v.—was commonly used as a woman's cosmetic; *fucus* is subsequently used to refer to any female cosmetic dye (especially rouge); cf. e.g. Pl. *Mos.* 275, Prop. 2.18.31–2 *an si caeruleo quaedam sua tempora fuco/tinxerit*, Tib. 1.8.11 (Marathus adopting female customs). *perfundo*, which usually describes the spreading of a liquid, is sometimes used of loose solids (*OLD* s.v. 4, *Thes.* 10.1.1423.13ff.).

The phrase, then, may potentially allude to three different vices—military glory, political advancement and personal vanity—all of which are shunned by the wise astronomer.

304 magnarumque fames . . . opum: for *fames* denoting a metaphorical hunger, especially for riches, cf. Verg. *A.* 3.57, Hor. *Carm.* 3.16.17–18 *crescentem sequitur cura pecuniam/maiorumque fames*, *Ep.* 1.18.23, *Thes.* 6.1.233.8ff. For the cyclic nature of the vice—the greater the riches, the greater the hunger—see 211–12n., 213–14n.

sollicitavit: the verb reinforces the idea that such earthly pursuits are far removed from the calm, divine reflection of intellectual pursuits like astronomy.

305–6 admovere oculis distantia sidera nostris/aetheraque ingenio subposuere suo "They moved the distant stars to *our* own eyes, because they subjected the heavens to the operation of *their* own intellect": Alton (1973) 145 offers the emendation *mentis* for *nostris* (codd.), on the grounds that *nostris* is too weak and creates pointless antithesis with *suo* (306). But this misses the force of *nostris* in the context. So far, Ovid has set up two opposing camps: on the one side, the intellectual stargazers and, on the other, the average Roman (in which the poet appears to include himself (301)). In 309–10, Ovid will confidently pledge to follow these intellectuals by means of his

own study of the stars. How is Ovid able to switch camps so suddenly? The retention of *nostris* in 305 bridges the gap: astronomers have revealed their science to ordinary people, perhaps in the form of astronomical writings, and thus provide guidance to any amateur enthusiast. The antithesis in *nostris* . . . *suo* is, therefore, both deliberate and pointed, and the force of *nostris* will be picked up by *nos quoque* in 309.

306 aetheraque: for the explicative—*que*, see 446n.

ingenio: this could mean 'intellect' in general or, more specifically, 'poetic genius' (18n.), thus strengthening the case the Ovid is praising literary predecessors in this section; see 295–310 (i) n.

subposuere: according to *OLD* and Lewis/Short s.v., this is the only instance of the verb to denote mastery over a particular topic.

307–8 The Gigantomachic imagery here provides a forceful means of distinguishing between right and wrong ways of approaching heaven: one should approach mentally by study of the stars, rather than physically like the barbarous Giants. In doing so, Ovid takes a traditional (largely Stoic) line that the Giants are far removed from the world of the divine and the intellectual; cf. esp. Hor. *Carm.* 3.4.42–80, esp. 65–8 *vis consili expers mole ruit sua/vim temperatam di quoque provehunt/in maius; idem odere vires/omne nefas animo moventis*; F. Vian (1952), "La guerre des géants devant les penseurs de l'antiquité", *REG* 65, 22ff. For Ovid's blurring of the distinction between Giant and philosopher elsewhere, however, see 298n.

The Gigantomachic imagery here may also be interpreted on a generic level. Gigantomachy is popularly identified as a topic appropriate only for epic; cf. *Am.* 2.1.11–16, Prop. 2.1.19–20, 3.9.47–8. As such, Ovid's rejection of the Giants in favour of the astronomer might be read as a generic code for his rejection of epic and embracing of a peaceful theme which is compatible with elegiac ideals: this, for Ovid, is the right way to 'reach the heavens' (i.e. achieve everlasting poetic fame).

307 sic petitur caelum: the phrase recalls Apollo's words to Ascanius at Verg. *A.* 9.641—*sic itur ad astra*—but the sentiment has been reversed. In *Aeneid*, Apollo reassures the young prince that it is through military exploits that he will reach the heavens as a god (9.641–4). Ovid reverses the Vergilian sentiment: it is not through martial conquest but through a study of the stars—rejected by Anchises as a proper pursuit for a Roman in *Aeneid* (6.847–53)—that heaven will be reached. In the process, however, the sentiment implicitly challenges the Hellenistic mode of deification, which was adopted for Julius Caesar (and later Augustus himself); see 295–310 (ii) n.

non ut "not in such a way which results in"

307–8 ferat Ossan Olympus/summaque Peliacus sidera tangat apex: Ovid suggests that, in their attempt on heaven, the Giants piled Ossa on top on Olympus, and then Pelion on Ossa. Ovid follows this order elsewhere (3.441–2, *Am.* 2.1.13–14), which finds support from the oldest authority (Hom. *Od.* 11.307–16); for different ordering of the mountains, cf. e.g. *Met.* 1.154–5 (the order appears to be, in ascending order, Ossa, Pelion and Olympus), Verg. *G.* 1.281–2, Hyg. *Fab.* 28, Tarrant on Sen. *Ag.* 345ff.

309–10 A final, spirited pledge from Ovid to assign days to the stars by following in the footsteps of his famous predecessors.

In an attempt to fend off criticism for not following a military career, Roman love-elegists, and Ovid in particular, regularly express their amatory pursuits in military terms (*militia amoris*); see esp. *Am.* 1.9 with McKeown ad loc. A similar tactic is adopted in these lines, as another non-Roman lifestyle, the study of the stars, is expressed using military terminology (*ducibus, metabimur* and the play on *signa*). In describing intellectual pursuits in military terms, Ovid is influenced by the famous description of Epicurus as 'victorious general' at Lucr. 1.75–9. In tune with the generic considerations of the poem, however, Ovid adopts the more 'peaceful' military imagery of land-surveying (see *metabimur* n.).

309 nos quoque emphatically picks up *nostris* (305–6 with n.).

ducibus: for the variable identity of these 'leaders', see 295–310 (i) n.

metabimur: *metor* is most popularly used in the military sense of the surveying and marking-out of land for a camp; cf. e.g. Sal. *Iug.* 106.5 *Sulla pariter cum ortu solis castra metabatur*, Liv. 27.48.2, Tac. *Ann.* 1.63.5, *Thes.* 8.892.20ff. Though the extension of the verb to describe the astronomer's charting of the skies is very rare (cf. Mart. Cap. 1.27), Ovid may well be influenced by Cicero, who uses a compound of this verb (*dimeto/dimetor*) in the same sense; cf. Cic. *N.D.* 2.110 *atque ita dimetata signa sunt*, 2.155.

310 vaga signa: the phrase more naturally refers to the planets (πλανῆται, 'the wanderers'), which were in constant motion, rather than the constellations, whose position in the sky was fixed; for the distinction, cf. Cic. *N.D.* 2.80 *dico ... et vagas stellas et inerrantes*, Man. 1.52, 2.743, Luc. 9.12–13 *stellasque vagas miratus et astra/fixa polis*. This is intriguing in view of the fact that Ovid does not deal with the planets anywhere in *Fasti*. Two solutions are possible. Ovid could be using the phrase loosely to refer to the constellations: they are 'moving' in the sense that they seem to appear and disappear at different points

in the year; see e.g. Frazer ad loc., Gee (2000) 59 n. 94. Alternatively, it has been suggested that this phrase marks the most obvious sign of revision in the section: Ovid did indeed deal with the planets and their astrological power in the first version of the poem; after the Augustan edict of A.D. 11 banning astrologers, Ovid removed the sensitive material about the planets, but overlooked his initial pledge in 310; see Herbert-Brown (2002) 121–8; see also 295–310 (i) n.

The use of *signa* also perhaps plays on the military imagery of the couplet ('standards'); see 309–10n.

311–14 The first astronomical observation (Crab)

i. *The Stars and the Calendars*

Study of the constellations is, for Ovid, a special part of the make-up of *Fasti*. It is given particular prominence in the short proem to the poem; cf. 2 *lapsaque sub terras ortaque signa canam.* Furthermore, Ovid has just prefaced this note (311–14), the first astronomical comment of the poem, with a eulogy to astronomers (295–310 with nn.) which pays homage to their intellect and serves to introduce formally the poet's own treatment of the stars.

That Ovid feels the need to give his stellar material an introduction of its own is symptomatic of the fact that astronomical comment does not usually form part of the official calendars. Even when it does occur in certain calendars, it is very formulaic and narrowly-focused, highlighting little more than the movement of the Sun into a new sign of the zodiac; cf. *Fasti Venusini* (Degrassi 55ff.) *Sol in Gemin(is)* [May 18], *Sol in Cancro* [Jun. 19], *Solstitium confec(tum)* [Jun. 26], *Fasti Antiates Ministrorum Domus Augustae* (Degrassi 208ff.) *Sol in Sagitt(ario)* [Nov. 17], *Fasti Furii Filocali* (Degrassi 238ff.) *Sol Aquario* [Jan. 23, and similar references in every month]. Ovid's dealings with the stars in this poem are, however, much more elaborate and varied.

ii. *Stellar Material and Sources*

Generally speaking, Ovid's astronomical comments can be placed into two categories:

Astronomical Observation

The first category consists of short astronomical observations (no more than six lines) on the rising or setting of a particular constellation, sometimes accompanied by meteorological comment; cf. 311–14, 315–16, 457–8, 651–2, 653–4, 655–6, 2.73–8, 457, 3.399–402, 711–12, 4.163–4, 387–8, 677–8, 901–4, 5.415–16, 417–18, 599–600, 723, 733–4, 6.195–6, 197–8, 235–6, 471–2, 711–12, 717–20, 727, 787–8.

Observation of the constellations was originally important to sailors and (especially) farmers who, in the absence of a reliable calendar, used the stars as a means of measuring time and predicting weather, so that they could ascertain the best time to sail or perform the seasonal agricultural tasks. Hesiod is the first extant author to draw attention to the value of stellar observation, when he instructs his addressee as to what task should be performed when a certain constellation appears (Hes. *Op.* 383–694); cf. e.g. 383–4 (begin harvest at the rising of the Pleiades), 564–7, 597–9. This practical benefit of stellar observation is later highlighted by Aratus (758ff. 'Weather-Signs'); the Roman prose agricultural writers (Cato, Varro, Columella and Pliny); Julius Caesar, who is reputed to have written *De Astris*, a treatise which predicted seasons and weather patterns by study of the stars; cf. Plin. *Nat.* 18.214, Rawson (1985) 112, 165; Vergil in his *Georgics* (cf. e.g. 1.208–11, 225–30, 351–5); and the two extant *Menologia* (Degrassi 284–98), farming calendars which date from at least the Augustan period; see, in general, Gee (2000) 9–15.

Study of the stars became, however, as much an intellectual pursuit as a practical necessity. Hesiod may have been the first to devote an entire poem to the subject: a poem entitled *Astronomia* is attributed to him by Athenaeus (*Dip.* 11.491c). Later, in the third century B.C., Aratus, working from an earlier prose treatise by Eudoxus, sets forth in verse the astronomical geography of the sky in his *Phaenomena*, a work which proves very popular among the elite at Rome (see below).

Star Myths

The second category—not found until book 2—generally consists of observation of the rising or setting of a particular constellation, followed by a mythical, anthropomorphic story explaining its presence in the sky; cf. 2.79–118 (Dolphin), 153–92 (Bear), 243–66 (Snake,

Bowl and Bird), 457–74 (Fish), 3.403–14 (Grape-gatherer), 449–58 (Pegasus), 459–516 (Crown), 793–808 (Kite), 851–76 (Ram), 4.165–78 (Pleiads), 713–20 (Bull/Cow), 5.111–28 (She-goat), 159–82 (Hyades), 379–414 (Chiron), 493–544 (Orion), 603–20 (Bull), 693–720 (Twins). This type of story might again go back to Hesiod's lost *Astronomia.* It is certainly a notable feature of Aratus' *Phaenomena* (cf. 71–3, 96–136, 205–24, 637–46), and the principal theme of the *Catasterismoi* of Eratosthenes and the *De Astronomia* of Ovid's contemporary Hyginus. Perhaps most significantly for a study of the poem, at least one such myth appeared in Callimachus' *Aetia*; cf. fr. 110 Pf. (the Lock of Berenice explains how it was transferred to the sky).

iii. *Motivation for including Stellar Material*

The official calendars, then, offer no real precedent for the inclusion of the stars: so why does Ovid choose to include such wide-ranging stellar material in this poem? Responses have been diverse.

On a poetic level, Ovid's inclusion of stellar material associates *Fasti* with a sophisticated (largely Hellenistic) tradition, and plays a part in articulating the generic tensions of the poem, between epic and elegy (Hinds (1992) 113, Newlands (1995) 31–2) and epic and didactic (Gee (2000) 21–65).

There are political motivations as well. First, continuing the work initiated by Julius Caesar, Augustus had recently completed a successful reformation of the calendar so that it became, for the first time, a reliable means of measuring time; for the problems of the pre-Julian calendar, see Herbert-Brown (1994) 15–26. Ovid may be celebrating this achievement by purporting to offer, for the first time, 'reliable' dating of the rising and setting of stars, even though the stars' traditional role as measurer of time was now strictly redundant; see Gee (2000) 9–14; for the 'inaccuracies' in Ovid's dating of the stars, and the slipperiness of his time references in general, see below and 311–12n.

Secondly, it is quite apparent that discourse on the stars was inextricably linked to the politics of the late Republic/early Empire. Several prominent Romans advertised their interests in astronomy in the late Republic: the most notable were Varro, P. Nigidius Figulus (praetor 58 B.C.) and, of course, Julius Caesar (see (ii) above). Moreover, prominent individuals, the Julian family in particular, manipulated astronomical and astrological readings as a means of legitimizing

their own power and curbing that of others; such activity was particularly fervent in the latter years of Augustus and the early years of Tiberius, the era in which *Fasti* was written; see Barton (1994) 33–47. Ovid's selective inclusion of stellar material, therefore, might pay lip service to the increasingly important role of the stars in the everyday lives of upper class Romans and the running of Empire; for the marked absence of *astrology* from the poem, however, see 295–310 (i) n.

These reasons are valid to explain the *presence* of stellar material in the poem. They do little, however, to account for the sheer *range* of the material. Looking strictly within the context of the poem, recent scholars have argued for some sort of interaction between the world of humanly-constructed time (the calendar and its festivals) and the world of the eternal measure of time (stars).

Attempts to detect universal differences between each of these 'worlds' have been unconvincing. For example, Martin (1985) argues that the regularity of the stars provides stability in a calendar whose festivals are often of uncertain origin; certain episodes in the poem, however, have led scholars to precisely the opposite conclusion; see e.g. Phillips (1992) 65–8 on the episodes of the Lemuria and Orion in Book 5. A better approach is to study each stellar episode in its own particular context in an effort to assess any potential lines of interaction with the surrounding material; for criticism along this line, see 457–8n., 650n., Newlands (1995) 31ff., Barchiesi (1997) *passim*, Gee (2000) *passim*, (2002).

One (positive) result of this line of enquiry has been a greater willingness to explain Ovid's numerous inaccuracies in dating the rising and setting of stars—for which, see Ideler (1825), Gee (2000) 205–8—in terms other than authorial ignorance and naivety. It is suggested, rather, that Ovid takes advantage of the lack of consensus in dating the stars to locate stellar material in precisely the context he chooses; see 457–8n., 650n.

iv. *Immediate Political Interest—The* Aratus *ascribed to Germanicus?*

There survives to us a fragmentary Latin poem, probably known simply as *Aratus*, which is (for the most part) a loose translation of Aratus' *Phaenomena*. It is ascribed by some to Germanicus (Lactantius *Inst.* 1.21.28, 5.5.4, Jerome *Comment. Ep. Tit.* 1.12). This raises the interesting possibility that Ovid included stellar material in *Fasti*, in

part, to reflect the literary and thematic interests of his new patron. We might even go further and assess whether Ovid consulted this work as one of his sources for the stellar material of *Fasti*; see Syme (1978) 46, Fantham (1985) 254–6, Gee (2000) 66–70.

Unfortunately, the Latin *Aratus* that we possess yields more questions than answers. Both external and internal evidence make it unclear whether the author is the prince Germanicus or his adopted father Tiberius, who was himself often referred to as Germanicus (Dio 57.8.2); see Gain (1976) 17, 20. Assuming that it was the work of our Germanicus, it is very unclear whether Ovid would have even known about it. First, there is a reference in the poem to the apotheosis of Augustus (558–60) which suggests a dating for the poem too late for Ovid to have realistically been able to take account of it: Le Boueffle [(1975) vii–x] suggests that the poem was started in the year of Ovid's death (A.D. 17), at a time when the prince had been recalled from Germany and before his campaign in the East. The issue of dating aside, translating Aratus was evidently popular among the Romans: we know of previous translations by Cicero, Varro of Atax and even Ovid himself. It may have been considered an ideal exercise for budding writers at the start of their literary careers; cf. Cic. *N.D.* 2.104 *utar . . . carminibus Arateis, quae a te admodum adulescentulo conversa ita me delectant* (Balbus to Cicero), Hinds (1987) 13, Gee (2000) 68–70. In light of this, it is difficult to see why Germanicus' version might have been worthy of any special attention (or even memory); see Herbert-Brown (1994) 176–8.

Internal evidence of *Fasti* 1 confirms such suspicions, as there are almost no tangible allusions to *Aratus*. The only peculiar linguistic connection between the two is the use of the name *Delphin* to refer to the Dolphin constellation (457–8n.), but it would be imprudent to draw any conclusions from this.

It would be fair to say that the stellar material of *Fasti* may have been partly motivated by the literary interests of Germanicus. However, even assuming that Germanicus is the author of *Aratus*, any allusion between the two works is probably (happily) coincidental.

v. *The Setting of the Crab (3rd January)*

Ovid's suggestion that the constellation of the Crab sets during the night of 2nd or 3rd January (see 311–12n.) may not be entirely cor-

rect: Ideler (1825) 155–6 suggests that the constellation set on the *morning* of 3rd; cf. Col. 11.2.97 *tertio nonas Ianuarias Cancer occidit* (possibly the same date as Ovid, but the time of day is not made clear).

It has been suggested that Ovid's first astronomical observation of the poem creates an intertextual dialogue with the opening of the fourth book of Propertius; see Barchiesi (1991) 1–3, Newlands (1995) 35–6, 126, Gee (2000) 30–4. In Prop. 4.1, the astrologer Horos concludes his warning to the poet not to abandon the field of love-poetry in favour of loftier themes by pointing out the danger of the constellation of the Crab; cf. Prop. 4.1.150 *octipedis Cancri terga sinistra time!* The precise meaning of Horos' final exclamation has long been a matter a dispute, but it is now generally believed to be a complex astrological code which reinforces the warning to Propertius that he should not (or cannot) turn his literary course; see esp. Nethercut (1968), (1970), Marquis (1973).

Ovid's phraseology in 313–14 is clearly intended to recall Propertius: *octipes* is only elsewhere found in late Latin (Auson. *Ecl.* 14.8.3). There is, however, a marked difference: whereas Prop. 4.1.150 suggests the rising of the Crab, Ovid witnesses its setting. Ovid may, therefore, be hinting that the malign astronomical force which prevented Propertius from a sustained aetiological elegiac poem is absent at the start of his poem. Ovid's replacement of Propertius' *terga* for *bracchia* (313) might even point to another intertext, namely the first astronomical observation of Vergil's *Georgics* (1.34–5), in which a similarly baleful constellation (Scorpion) shows itself in submissive fashion at the outset of a 'serious' didactic poem: *ipse tibi iam bracchia contrahit ardens/Scorpios et caeli iusta plus parte reliquit.*

The potential poetic/generic significance of the Crab in *Fasti* is further evidenced by its reappearance at 6.727 as a visibly bright star (*Cancri signa rubescunt*): coming close to the end of the extant poem, its presence might be interpreted as a sign that Ovid's aetiological elegiac poem is no longer sustainable.

311–12 ergo ubi nox aderit venturis tertia Nonis,/sparsaque caelesti rore madebit humus "Therefore, when the third night before the coming Nones has approached, and the ground has been moistened here and there by heavenly dew": the time reference in 311 is not straightforward, because it is unclear from which point in the day of the Nones (5th) Ovid is making his calculation. Commentators tend to take this as referring to 3rd, in agreement

with Columella's dating (11.2.97). This would involve including the night of the Nones in the calculation: the third night before the Nones, counting inclusively, would therefore be 3rd. But *venturis* ... *Nonis* might equally, or perhaps more naturally, refer to the *morning* of the Nones; the third *night* previous would then be 2nd. This is only the first in a series of ambiguous time references in *Fasti*, which remind us that the poem was never designed to be a straightforward poetic reproduction of the official calendars; see 315n., 317n., 655n., Barchiesi (1997) 103–4, esp. Robinson (2000) 1–37.

311 ergo harps back to the preceding eulogy (295–310): i.e. now that the subject-matter has been shown to be worthy, and that astronomical amateurs like Ovid have guidance from eminent predecessors.

aderit: Ovid prefers to speak about the rising and setting of constellations in the future tense; cf. e.g. 315–16, 651–2, 653–4, 655–6, 2.73–8, 3.399–400, 711–12, 4.387–8, 901–4, 5.415–16, 417–18, 599–600, 733–4, 6.471–2, 711–12, 717–20, 787–8; for the present tense, cf. e.g. 457–8, 2.457, 4.163–4, 5.723, 6.195–6, 197–8, 235–6, 727.

312 caelesti rore: the fall of dew is more commonly associated with the morning, and (mythologically) with the tears of the Dawn goddess Aurora, who grieves daily for the loss of her son, Memnon; for the story, cf. *Met.* 13.576–622 with Bömer ad loc., Stat. *Silv.* 5.1.34–5, Serv. *A.* 1.489; for morning dew in Ovid's astronomical references, cf. e.g. 3.403–4 *cum croceis rorare genis Tithonia coniunx/coeperit*, 711–12, 4.165–6, 6.199–200. But, as here, it is occasionally also associated with the evening; cf. e.g. 2.314 *Hesperos et fusco roscidus ibat equo*, *Am.* 1.6.55, Lucr. 6.864, Caes. *Civ.* 3.15.4. *caelesti rore* is, nevertheless, a novel phrase which in only subsequently found at Marcell. *Med.* 835 and Cassiod. *Inst. Div.* 3 p. 1115 (*Thes.* 3.70.20–1).

313 octipedis: see 311–14 (v) n.

314 praeceps occiduas ille subibit aquas "headlong it will go beneath the western waters": anthropomorphic interpretation of the constellations/Sun gave rise to the convention of explaining their setting in terms of the animals/entities they represented plunging into the sea; cf. e.g. 2.77–8 *medii quoque terga Leonis/in liquidas subito mersa notabit aquas*, 4.164, 387–8, 6.717, Hes. *Op.* 619–20 εὖτ' ἂν Πληιάδες ... πίπτωσιν ἐς ἠεροειδέα πόντον, Arat. 591–3. Therefore, setting in the West is equated with plunging into western waters; cf. e.g. 2.73 *proximus Hesperias Titan abiturus in undas*, *Tr.* 4.3.4 (Greater and Lesser Bear).

315–16 If Ovid is here suggesting that the Lyre—a small constellation with one bright star (see Kidd on Arat. 268–74)—rises on

the Nones (i.e. 5th January), he is in agreement with both Columella (11.2.97) and Pliny (*Nat.* 18.234); for the ambiguity of the time reference, see 315n. The ancient sources seem to have erred considerably here, as the apparent morning rising may have occurred on 5th November; see Ideler (1825) 145. Ovid will later note the constellation's apparent setting (653–4 with n.), true setting (2.73–8) and reappearance (5.415–6).

For Ovid, it is the observance of the weather that will offer signs of the constellation; cf. (possibly) 4.903–4 *et frustra pecudem quaeres Athamantidos Helles,/ signaque dant imbres, exoriturque Canis* (where either *signa* or *imbres* could be subject) also perhaps 4.385–6 (rain recalls the presence of Libra). This is a novel reversal of the branch of astronomical observation, exemplified by Aratus (758ff.), which places emphasis on the benefit of the stars in the prediction of weather patterns; for the astronomical traditions, see 311–14 (ii) n.

315 institerint Nonae: the verb is ambiguous—the phrase could mean either 'if the Nones are present' (i.e. 5th) or 'if the Nones are looming' (i.e. 4th); for *insto* meaning 'present', cf. e.g. Cic. *Rhet. Her.* 2.8, *OLD* s.v. 6c; for 'looming', cf. e.g. 6.247, *Met.* 9.770, *OLD* s.v. 6; for the general slipperiness of Ovid's time references, see 311–12n. For the removal of *si* in the protasis of conditional clauses, cf. e.g. Tib. 1.6.53 *adtigerit, labentur opes*, Hor. *S.* 2.7.32, Mart. 3.38.8, H.-Sz. 657.

315–16 missi . . . nubibus atris/ . . . imbres: Columella likewise informs us (11.2.97) that the weather that accompanies the rising of the Lyre is inclement: the previous day is windy and rainy (*Auster multus, interdum pluvia*), and the actual day typically unsettled (*tempestas varia*).

317–456 9th January Agonalia

317–18 Marked by the initials AGON in the Maffeian and Praenestine calendars (Degrassi 72, 112), the festival is referred to in the singular here by Ovid (cf. 318 *Agonali luce*, 324 *Agonalem . . . diem*) and in the plural by other authors; cf. Var. *L.* 6.12 *dies Agonales*, 6.14 *Agonia*, Fest. 9 L. *Agonalia eius festivitatem.* Any apparent discrepancy is, however, eliminated when we consider that three other days in the year are marked by the letters AGON, AGO or AG: 17th March (Caeretan and Vatican calendars), 21st May (Esquiline, Caeretan, Venusian

and Maffeian calendars) and 11th December (Maffeian, Praenestine and Antian calendars). It is, therefore, generally held that Ovid is here referring to the one specific instance of the festival on 9th January; the other authors are grouping the four days together. Ovid's testimony suggests that there is little difference between the festival on these four dates: in noting the Agonalia on 21st May, the poet deems it sufficient to refer the reader back to this section; cf. 5.721–2 *ad Ianum redeat, qui quaerit Agonia quid sint:/quae tamen in fastis hoc quoque tempus habent.*

The precise nature of the festival, the meaning of the term *Agonalis* and the connection between the four dates, were evidently open to differences of opinion. Not only do scholars such as Varro and Festus entertain variant etymologies (see individual nn.), but a mutilated excerpt from the Praenestine calendar reveals enough to suggest that the official *fasti* could offer no definitive answer; cf. *Agonia . . . aut quia* (Degrassi 112). No consensus has been reached in recent times; see e.g. Wissowa (1912) 29, Scullard (1981) 60–1, *OCD* s.v. 'Agonium'. Ovid's subsequent engagement in variant etymology (319–32) is therefore, on one level, an inevitable part of dealing with this festival. In this section, however, the quest for a 'true' etymology is of secondary importance to Ovid next to his ability and desire to manipulate the technique of offering variant interpretations; see 319–32n.

317 quattuor adde dies ductos ex ordine Nonis "Add on to the Nones four days taken in succession": though Ovid must mean 9th January here, his instruction to add four days to the Nones (5th) does not follow the usual Roman rule of inclusive counting; for the general slipperiness of Ovid's time references, see 311–12n. *ductos* (Mς) here expresses a temporal sequence from one point to another; cf. e.g. Verg. *A.* 1.641–2 *series longissima rerum/per tot ducta viros antiqua ab origine gentis* (embossed history of Dido's race), Man. 3.511, *Thes.* 5.1.2165.5ff.

318 Ianus Agonali luce piandus erit: though Ovid states that Janus receives the honours on this particular Agonal day, it is by no means certain that this was the case on all such Agonalia. Indeed, in the Venusian calendar, 21st May is marked by the words AG.N VEDIOVI (Degrassi 57), which suggests that different gods were worshipped on the different Agonalia; see Fowler (1969) 280–2.

Ovid usually introduces the religious rites pertaining to specific days in a straightforwardly factual manner; cf. e.g. 461–2, 587–8, 617–18, 2.267–8, 3.809–10, 4.393. But occasionally he adopts a more

didactic stance, as if instructing an audience to perform a particular rite; with an insistent gerundive (as here: *piandus*), cf. 3.881–2 *Ianus adorandus cumque hoc Concordia mitis/et Romana Salus Araque Pacis erit*; with jussive subjunctive, cf. 2.639–40; most commonly with imperatives, in the manner of a Master of Ceremony, see 657–704 (ii) n.

319–32 Ovid proceeds by giving a series of possible etymologies for the term *Agonalis*. He offers potentially seven different etymologies for the festival name, and it is methodically arranged so that each of the seven couplets in this section contains one etymology. This is the joint highest number of etymologies offered by Ovid on a particular word or custom in the poem, along with the seven interpretations given for the use of fire at the Parilia (4.783–806); cf. 3.543–674 (five interpretations of Anna Perenna), 771–88 (four reasons why the toga is given on Bacchus' day), 839–46 (four reasons for the name Minerva Capta). Nevertheless, our section is much more concise and etymologically compact than that at 4.783–806.

The setting out of variant interpretations for a given word, custom or tradition is a well-established practice for didactic writers, in whichever field they are seeking to give instruction; cf. e.g. Verg. *G.* 1.84–93 (various reasons to farmers why stubble in fields should be burned), Prop. 4.2.10, 11, 47, 57 (etymologies of the name Vertumnus by the god himself), 4.10.45–8 (reasons behind the name Feretrius for Jupiter). Furthermore, though the text has not survived, we are informed from the scholia that variant interpretation was a feature of Callimachus' *Aetia*, an important model for *Fasti*; cf. Pf. i.13 *Schol. Flor.* ad frr. 3–7 (several traditions are entertained concerning the origin of the Graces).

It is not surprising then to witness variant interpretations in a poem like *Fasti*, which frequently adopts a didactic mode; see 27–62n. Ovid displays considerable variety in his handling of this didactic technique. In its barest form, as in 319–32, Ovid simply sets out a list of possible interpretations without detailed elaboration; cf. also 2.31–4, 3.839–46. On other occasions, he will elaborate the circumstances surrounding some or all of the possibilities he lists; cf. e.g. 2.283–380 (why the Luperci run naked), 3.543–674 (Anna Perenna). Furthermore, this technique is occasionally concealed within a particular dramatic framework; cf. 103–44 (the god Janus gives different reasons for his name and function), 5.1–110, 6.1–100 (lively discussions of the reason for the naming of May and June, conducted respectively by Muses and goddesses).

There is, however, particular justification for engaging in exegesis in a work, like *Fasti*, which deals with religious festivals. The Romans had no dogmatic religious tradition to which to refer, and the significance of the festivals was in a constant state of negotiation. For this reason exegesis, far from being a practice which confused or obscured religious 'truths', was in fact the very essence of religious experience, in that each individual was required to make enquiries for themselves concerning the origin and meaning of sacred rites; see, in general, Beard (1987), Scheid (1992) 122ff., Feeney (1998) 127–31. Furthermore, since the starting point for any exegetic enquiry could range from the ceremony itself to perhaps a single word of gesture within it, the practice of exegesis emerged as a creative 'game' which knew few restrictions; see Scheid (1992) 122–4.

It is the opportunity for creativity afforded by exegesis which appeals most to Ovid. In a recent study of 319–32, it has been convincingly argued that there is a conscious selectivity regarding the poet's etymological suggestions in this section; see Miller (1992b). Most significantly, Ovid makes no mention of the purported connection between the term *Agonalis* and the Quirinal hill, even though it was widely entertained in his own day; cf. Var. *L.* 6.14, Dion. Hal. 2.70.1 (the *Salii* of this hill are referred to as Agonal), Fest. 9 L. *hinc Romae mons Quirinalis Agonus et Collina porta Agonensis.* Instead, Ovid's chosen etymologies keep the focus of attention on the theme of animal sacrifice, which helps to pave the way for his subsequent examination of the history of the practice in 337–456. Exegesis in 319–32, therefore, emerges first and foremost as an important programmatic motif, within which the poet displays an ability to use a variety of etymologising techniques (see 325–6n., 328n.). For Ovid's history of animal sacrifice, see 349–456n.

319 nominis esse potest . . . causa: Ovid varies the formulae he uses to introduce his etymologies; cf. 324 *nomen Agonalem . . . habere diem*, 325 *festum . . . dictum*, 328 *lux est . . . notata.*

succinctus . . . minister: in the sacrificing of victims to the gods, it was customary for an attendant known as the *popa* to strike the victim to the ground first, after which the presiding priest, here the *rex sacrorum* (see 333n.), would conduct the sacrifice; see BNP I.36–7, II.148–9. Ovid uses *minister* as a generic term for any of these specific priests; cf. 4.413 *a bove succincti cultros removete ministri*, *Tr.* 4.2.35; also Lucr. 1.90, Luc. 1.612, *Thes.* 8.1000.56ff. As Ovid's phraseology implies, the traditional attire of any type of religious attendant was

a robe girt up by a belt; cf. 4.413, 5.675 (merchant conducting rites), Ap. Rhod. 1.425–6, Prop. 4.3.62 *succinctique calent ad nova lucra popae*, Suet. *Cal.* 32.3, Serv. *A.* 12.12.

Though he is building towards the etymology from the spoken gesture *agone* (see 322n.), Ovid says here that the festival name comes from the *minister*, which might refer to the noun *ago, -nis* ('an attendant'), attested elsewhere only by Lactantius Placidus on Stat. *Theb.* 4.463: *sacerdotum consuetudo talis est, ut ipsi percutiant victimas—et 'agones' appellantur.*

321 qui calido strictos tincturus sanguine cultros: by placing the subordinate clause before the main clause, Ovid is able to capture dramatically in isolation the very moment of sacrifice, with the knife drawn and the spilling of warm blood imminent. This dramatic moment was in fact popularly portrayed in the iconography of sacrifice in the Augustan age; see Kuttner (1995) 131–5. The moment of sacrifice, seen here from the point of view of the human attendant, will be met in 327–8 with the viewpoint of the victim.

322 semper agatne rogat nec nisi iussus agit "he always asks whether or not he should proceed, and not unless he is bidden does he proceed": in sacrifice, it was customary before business for the attendant to ask *agone* ('shall I proceed?'), to which the reply in the affirmative was *hoc age*; cf. Sen. *Con.* 2.3.19 *'agon?' quod fieri solet victumis* (mock-sacrificial scenario), Suet. *Cal.* 58.2 (the killer of Caligula ironically calls *hoc age* before striking), Plu. *Cor.* 25.3. Its verbal similarity to the term *Agonalis* is attractive, and the etymology had already been suggested by Varro; cf. Var. *L.* 6.12 *dies Agonales . . . dicti ab 'agon', eo quod interrogatur a principe civitatis et princeps gregis immolatur.* This was perhaps the most accepted derivation in Ovid's time, given its endorsement by Varro and the well-attested usage of the spoken gesture in sacrifice. What is significant, however, is that Ovid places no emphasis upon it. Unlike Varro, who regularly backs up his etymologies by naming previous advocators of a particular derivation, Ovid offers no such supporting evidence and simply places this etymology indiscriminately in the list. Both the subordination of this etymology, and the (surprising) enthusiasm for the last derivation listed (331–2), suggest that Ovid is manipulating the process of exegesis essentially to forward his own thematic agenda; see 319–32n., 332n.

323–4 "Because the animals do not come, but are driven, it is from this driving of the victims that some believe the Agonal day took its name": the proposed etymology from the driving of the animals is stressed by the compact periphrasis *non veniant . . . sed agantur,*

ab actu, and by the completely dactylic nature of 323, which drives the reader along as well as the victim. Having established the primary link between *Agonalis* and the verb *ago* in 319–22 (see nn.), Ovid cleverly makes use of the versatility of the verb: by changing its voice and sense, the focus is now subtly transferred from the human sphere to that of the sacrificial animal.

323 ab actu: either 'from this act' or, perhaps better, 'from this driving (of victims)', etymologically linked to the preceding *agantur* (*Thes.* 1.449.77ff.).

325–6 "Some think that this festival was called *Agnalia* by the ancients, such that one letter has been removed from its characteristic place": the clause introduced by *ut* in 326 must be taken with *pars*: it is the contemporary thinkers of Ovid's day, conjecturing what the ancients might have called the festival, who are the ones removing the letter 'o' from its customary place. The term *Agnalia* (**M**ω) is not attested elsewhere in Latin. However, given the etymological nature of this section, it is reasonable to assume that Ovid is encouraging us to see at its root the noun *agna*, and hence understand *Agnalia* as something like 'Festival of Lambs' (Frazer). Given the allusion to Callimachus' *Aetia* in the following lines (see 327n.), it has been suggested that Ovid may be alluding here to the 'lamb festival' connected to the story of Linus and Coroebus at Call. *Aet.* fr. 26–7 Pf.; see Frazel (2002).

No previous source connects *Agonalis* with *agna*, and it would seem that the poet has created the connection himself in order to keep the focus on the sacrificial animal. In the process, Ovid displays an understanding of etymological practice. Following in the footsteps of the Greek scholars, Varro (*L.* 5.6) sets out the four possible procedures for etymologising: *additio* (the adding of letters/syllables), *demptio* (the removing of letters/syllables), *commutatio* (the changing of letters/syllables) and *traiectio* (the moving around of letters/syllables); cf. Var. *L.* 6.2, Quint. *Inst.* 1.6.32; R. Maltby (1993), "The limits of etymologising", *Aevum (ant)* 6, 262ff. In suggesting that *Agonalia* may be an altered form of *Agnalia*, Ovid is clearly applying the technique of *demptio*: the technical term is perhaps alluded to in *dempta* (326).

327 quia praevisos in aqua timet hostia cultros "because the victim is afraid of the knife, which it has seen beforehand reflected in the water": the evocation of the moment before the sacrifice recalls 321 (see n.), but Ovid's switch from the human sphere to that of the animal is now complete. The sentiment is similar to that of

Ovid's Pythagoras who, in a speech on the barbarity of animal sacrifice, likewise champions the status of the animal as a sentient being; cf. *Met.* 15.134–5 *percussaque sanguine cultros/inficit in liquida praevisos forsitan unda* (note also that *praevideo* is used by Ovid only on these two occasions). Additional sympathy for the animal is achieved here by the suggestion that the animal shows, through its fear (*timet*), awareness of its impending death; contrast the ignorance of the animal in the speech of Pythagoras at *Met.* 15.130–5, esp. 132 *ignara.* In this respect, the phrase here is closer to the Callimachean source on which both Ovidian allusions are modelled; cf. Call. *Aet.* fr. 75.10–11 Pf. ἠῷοι μὲν ἔμελλον ἐν ὕδατι θυμὸν ἀμύξειν/οἱ βόες ὀξεῖαν δερκόμενοι δορίδα. The allusion to his own Pythagoras in *Met.* anticipates Ovid's adoption of a Pythagorean stance in the forthcoming section on sacrifice; see 349–456 (i) n.

328 a pecoris lux est ipsa notata metu? "is it from the animal's fear that this day has gained its mark in the calendar?": Ovid must be entertaining an etymology from the Greek ἀγών or ἀγωνία 'agony, mental anguish'. A continuum is thus made between the Greek and Latin languages, which was another standard etymologising practice adopted by Ovid; cf. 329–30 with n., 331 with n., 4.61–2 (April from ἀφρός), 5.535–6 (Orion from οὖρον), Var. *L.* 6.4, 10, 11, 33, 84, 96. It is bold of Ovid to suggest that the festival was named from the agony of the animal. Despite its being posed tentatively as a question, to entertain this etymology is to invite criticism of sacrifice. For *nota/notare* in the specific sense of calendar notation, see 8n.

329–30 "It is also possible that the day took a Greek name from the games which were accustomed to taking place in the age of our ancestors": the *ludi* referred to here are the ἀγῶνες, which originated in Greece as small-scale formal contests in honour of a particular god before the first extensive games at Olympia; see *OCD* s.v. 'agones' 2. Such a derivation is entertained later by Festus; cf. 9 L. *Agonium id est ludum, ob hoc dictum, quia locus, in quo ludi initio facti sunt, fuerit sine angulo; cuius festa Agonalia dicebantur.*

329 fas, usually meaning 'lawful' (see 25n.), seems here to be used in the weakened sense 'possible'; cf. *Tr.* 2.213, 3.12.41 *fas quoque ab ore freti longaeque Propontidos undis/huc aliquem certo vela dedisse Noto, Thes.* 6.1.293.34ff.

331 et pecus antiquus dicebat agonia sermo "Furthermore, the ancient dialect used to call a beast *agonia*": Festus likewise suggests that *Agonalis* is derived from *agonia,* a generic term for a beast

(cf. ἀγέλη); cf. Fest. 9 L. *Agonium dies appellabatur, quo rex hostiam immolabat; hostiam enim antiqui agoniam vocabant.* A beast was apparently so named because it was driven to the altar; cf. Fest. 9 L. *Agonias hostias putant ab agendo dictas*; see also 323–4n.

332 Ovid, hitherto neutral towards the variants he lists, lends his support to this final etymology. He gives no reason why he should approve this etymology. In fact, given the popularity of other etymologies (see 319–32n., 322n.), Ovid's endorsement here might come as something of a surprise. His preference, it would seem, serves as a thematic signpost: in accepting, albeit tentatively, a derivation from a generic word for animal (*pecus*), Ovid can progress easily to his discourse on the sacrificial fate of a wide variety of animals in 337ff.

This is one of the very few instances in the poem where the poet directly plumps for a particular interpretation (cf. e.g. 620), although he does elsewhere express some opinion over the variants he lists; cf. 3.661–2, 4.85–116 (Ovid's lack of support for a derivation of April from *aperio*), 793 *vix equidem credo* (disbelief of a certain aetiology for fire at the Parilia). More often in fact, Ovid is actively wary of choosing between variants; cf. 5.3–6, 108–10, 6.98–100 *res est arbitrio non dirimenda meo./ite pares a me. perierunt iudice formae/Pergama: plus laedunt, quam iuvat una, duae*, Porte (1985) 64ff.

veraque . . . causa: the phrase translates ἔτυμος λόγος, the standard term for the practice of word derivation (etymology).

333 utque . . . ita "although . . . nevertheless": the construction *ut . . . ita/sic* is prosaic and first transferred to poetry by Ovid; cf. e.g. 661 *utque dies incerta sacri, sic tempora certa, Met.* 1.369–70, Nep. *Paus.* 1.1, Liv. 21.11.5, H.-Sz. 633.

rex . . . sacrorum: the *rex sacrorum* (also referred to simply as *rex*) was the presiding individual who conducted official sacrifice, inheriting the religious function of the Roman kings; for his presence in the Agonalia specifically, cf. Var. *L.* 6.12 *dies Agonales per quos rex in regia arietem immolat*, Fest. 9 L. *Agonium dies appellabatur, quo rex hostiam immolabat*; for his presence at sacrifice in general, cf. e.g. Cic. *Dom.* 38, Liv. 9.34.12, Plin. *Nat.* 11.186, BNP I.54ff.

334 numina: either a poetic plural, referring simply to Janus (cf. 318), or else a reference to the gods in general (perhaps via Janus (cf. 171–4)).

lanigerae coniuge . . . ovis: though Var. *L.* 6.12 confirms the victim offered as a ram, Ovid's phraseology here is intriguing. It could be taken as a pompous periphrasis which adds to the solemn

ritual scene. *laniger* is a grand compound, predominantly found in high poetry; cf. e.g. *Met.* 3.585, 7.540, Lucr. 2.661, Verg. *A.* 3.660, *Thes.* 7.2.930.39ff. The use of *coniunx* to refer to an animal's mate is found first in Ovid; cf. 4.771, *Am.* 2.12.25 *vidi ego pro nivea pugnantes coniuge tauros,* 3.5.16, *Met.* 10.326, Sen. *Ag.* 353, *Thes.* 4.343.56ff. But more generally, referring to animal bonds in human terms is a well-established motif, which can serve to add mock-grandeur to their relationships; cf. Theoc. *Id.* 8.49, Hor. *Carm.* 1.17.7 with Nisbet/Hubbard. ad loc., Verg. *Ecl.* 7.7 *vir gregis ipse caper, G.* 3.125.

However, the specific usage of *laniger* and *coniunx* might promote a certain sympathy for the animals, as both terms anticipate key arguments in the forthcoming condemnation of sacrifice. *laniger* draws attention to the natural gift that the sheep regularly bestows upon man (provided that it is allowed to live); the nonsense of killing such beneficial animals is made more directly later; cf. 383–4 *quid tuti superest, animam cum ponat in aris/ lanigerumque pecus ruricolaeque boves* with n. The use of *coniunx* associates the bonds of mating animals with the sanctity of human marriage: this ploy is used more forcefully later to heighten the outrage of sacrifice; cf. 451–2 *ergo saepe suo coniunx abducta marito/ uritur . . . columba* with n.

335–6 Ovid gives etymologies for the two popular words for a sacrificial victim, *victima* and *hostia.* Some ancient authors attempt to distinguish the two in various ways; cf. e.g. Char. 403.38 *victima maior est, hostia minor* (terminology dependent on size), Serv. *A.* 1.334 (*hostia* sacrificed before marching into battle, *victima* afterwards). However, the etymologies put forward by our poet are hardly distinct; they in fact offer different perspectives on the same scene of conqueror subduing enemy. This reflects Ovid's usage of both terms: though he seems more fond of *victima* (25 times in Ovid, 8 in *Fasti*) than *hostia* (13 times in Ovid, 4 in *Fasti*), there is no discernible difference between them in his poetry. Indeed Servius, who does offer distinct etymologies (see above), acknowledges that both were used indiscriminately; cf. Serv. *A.* 1.334 *sed haec licenter confundit auctoritas.*

335 victima quae dextra cecidit victrice vocatur "the *victima* is so called because it has been struck by the victorious right hand": the suggestion seems to be that a *victima* is strictly the animal sacrificed by someone who has just achieved a military victory; cf. Fest. 508 L. *aut quae ob hostis victos immoletur,* Serv. *A.* 1.334 *victimae vero sacrificia quae post victoriam fiunt*; for variant interpretations, see Maltby 643 s.v.

336 hostibus a domitis hostia nomen habet "the *hostia* takes its name from the conquered *hostes* (enemies)": this interpretation is given elsewhere; cf. Isid. *Diff.* 1.523 *hostia quae devictis hostibus immolabatur*; for variant interpretations, see Maltby 284 s.v.

337–48 In the following section, Ovid recalls a time before the import of foreign offerings and animal sacrifice. Lines 337–8 take us back to a time when salt and emmer wheat were sufficient for sacrifice. Lines 339–42 inform us of those imports which had not yet been sought, and this is balanced in 343–6, where we learn that natural, indigenous gifts were used for ritual purposes instead. Finally, we learn that the knife, which now sacrifices animals, was at that time redundant (347–8). The time evoked here, introduced by *ante* (337), is that of the Golden Age (not early Rome [see 347–8n.]), and serves as an introduction to the forthcoming discourse on the origin of animal sacrifice (349ff.).

No previous Golden Age account specifically highlights the giving of indigenous offerings to the gods. However, the thought stems from a fundamental motif of this era, namely that ships were not yet in existence, and only came into being as the result of man's greedy desire to seek foreign wealth (see 339n.). Ovid therefore takes this traditional feature of the Golden Age and explores its possibilities within the context of sacrificial offerings, thus creating a tension between natural, indigenous gifts and those of foreign or animal extract. This section invites particular comparison with *Met.* 15.96ff., where Pythagoras speaks fondly of the Golden Age as a time in which animals roamed in safety before being killed; see also 337–8n., 349–456n., 349–52n.

337–8 "Long ago, what proved effective for man in winning over the gods was emmer wheat and bright grains of pure salt": in Ovid's time, it was customary for *far* (emmer wheat—see Spurr (1986) 10–13) and salt to be sprinkled over a victim prior to sacrifice, a process known as the *immolatio*. However, a live victim was an extravagant offering, as emmer and salt alone could be acceptably offered to the more humble or peaceful divinities; cf. e.g. 128 (to Janus); 2.535–8 *parva petunt manes: pietas pro divite grata est/munere . . . satis est . . . sparsae fruges parcaque mica salis* (to ghosts); 4.407–10 (to Ceres); Hor. *Carm.* 3.23.17–20 *immunis aram si tetigit manus . . . mollivit aversos Penatis/farre pio et saliente mica* (to the Penates); G. Williams (1969), *The Third Book of Horace's Odes*, Oxford, 119–22. By suggesting here that the hum-

bler gift (emmer and salt) came first, and that it was the original offering of the ancients, Ovid makes it evocative of pious simplicity: the moral overtones are highlighted by the emphasis on the brightness (*lucida*) and purity (*puri*) of the gift. The implication, which will be discussed later by Ovid, is that the use of a live victim emerged subsequently as a sign of moral degeneration after the Golden Age. This interpretation of animal sacrifice as emerging through moral decline follows, in more direct terms, the chronology of events advocated by Pythagoras at *Met.* 15.96ff.; cf. also Arat. 132, Verg. *G.* 2.536–8 (meat-eating as part of a post-Golden Age, but it is unclear whether sacrifice is also implied).

339 nondum governs the entire couplet; as such, Ovid is evoking the Golden Age, an era in which traditionally ships did not exist; cf. *Am.* 3.8.43–4 *non freta demisso verrebant eruta remo:/ultima mortali tum via litus erat, Met.* 1.94–6, Arat. 110–11, Verg. *Ecl.* 4.31–3, 37–9, *G.* 1.136, Tib. 1.3.37–40. *nondum* is a typical way of opening accounts of ancient ages, as it points up, from a contemporary's perspective, the negative elements which were not yet in existence; cf. 249, *Met.* 1.94–5 *nondum caesa suis, peregrinum ut viseret orbem,/montibus in liquidas pinus descenderat undas*, 97, Cat. 64.386, Tib. 1.3.37.

lacrimatas cortice murras: myrrh was a popular import from Arabia and Africa; cf. Stat. *Silv.* 2.1.161 with Van Dam ad loc., Plin. *Nat.* 12.66ff., Miller (1969) 104–5. It is represented here as tears which have been cried out from the bark of the tree. This is the first use of *lacrimo* to denote the resin of plant life, though the correlation between tree secretion and human tears was well-established among the Greeks (τὸ δάκρυον = 'resin'); cf. Hdt. 2.96, Thphr. *HP* 9.1.2, 9.4.4, 9.7.3, Plin. *Nat.* 17.107 *ideo lacrimantes calamos inseri non oportet, Thes.* 7.2.845.71ff. However, Ovid's adoption of this anthropomorphism ultimately reminds us that the myrrh tree is the result of the metamorphosed human girl, Myrrha; cf. *Met.* 10.298–502 esp. 501–2 *est honor et lacrimis, stillataque robore murra/nomen erile tenet nulloque tacebitur aevo.*

340 aequoreas . . . aquas: not found before Ovid, this is a very common Ovidian collocation (19 times, 5 in *Fasti*) which alludes to the well-established etymological connection between the two; cf. Var. *L.* 5.122 *origo potionis aqua, quod aequa summa*, Isid. *Orig.* 13.12.1, Maltby 44 s.v.

hospita navis "foreign ship": for the phraseology, cf. 4.298, *Tr.* 4.4.58, Stat. *Theb.* 5.336–7 *hospita . . . pinus, Thes.* 6.3.3033.3ff.; see also 511n. (*hospita tellus*).

341 tura nec Euphrates: Ovid is not suggesting that the Euphrates was the source of incense: it was widely known that it came largely from parts of Arabia; cf. 4.569 *turilegos Arabas*, Hdt. 3.97, Verg. *G.* 2.117, *A.* 1.416–17, Tib. 2.2.3–4, Mela 3.79–80, Plin. *Nat.* 12.51 *tura praeter Arabiam nullis ac ne Arabiae quidem universae.* Rather, Ovid is alluding to the fact that some incense trade passed along the Euphrates, the longest river in western Asia, on its way to Rome; see Miller (1969) 119ff. Ovid concurs here with the traditional belief that incense was a relatively recent innovation in sacrifice, perhaps still unknown in the time of early Rome; cf. Plin. *Nat.* 13.2 *Iliacis temporibus non erant, nec ture supplicabatur*, Porph. *Abst.* 2.5, Arnob. *Adv. Nat.* 7.26 *neque ipse Romulus aut religionibus artifex in comminiscendis Numa aut esse scivit aut nasci, ut pium far monstrat, quo peragi mos fuit sacrificiorum sollemnium munia.*

miserat India costum: India was the chief exporter of *costum*, which was a pungent herb found in black or white; cf. Thphr. *HP* 9.7.3, Stat. *Silv.* 2.1.160 with Van Dam ad loc., Plin. *Nat.* 12.41, Miller (1969) 84–6. It was used as incense for sacred rites (cf. Prop. 4.6.5, Luc. 9.917) and, as here, was regarded as the sort of imported luxury which invited (unfavourable) comparison with simple offerings; cf. Hor. *Carm.* 3.1.41–8 *quod si dolentem nec . . . delenit . . . nec Falerna/vitis Achaemeniumque costum . . . cur valle permutem Sabina/divitias operosiores?* For *mitto* used in the specific sense of the exporting of goods, cf. *Am.* 1.12.10, *Ars* 3.213, *Met.* 2.366, Verg. *G.* 1.57 *India mittit ebur*, Tib. 2.2.4, *OLD* s.v. 18, *Thes.* 8.1186.53ff.

342 rubri . . . fila croci: saffron (*crocus*), which was commonly used in Rome as a perfume for the stage (Prop. 4.1.16, Luc. 9.808ff.), was chiefly imported from the Asian province of Cilicia; cf. Lucr. 2.416 *et cum scena croco Cilici perfusa recens est*, Plin. *Nat.* 21.31. *filum*, literally 'thread', is transferred here to denote the 'fineness' of the plant's stamen; cf. 5.318 *filaque punicei . . . croci*, *Mor.* 89 *exiguo coriandra trementia filo*, Plin. *Nat.* 13.33, *Thes.* 6.1.762.41ff.

343 herbis . . . Sabinis: savine, a plant native to Italy, is a species of the juniper, with an aromatic odour which made it a suitable offering to burn; cf. Prop. 4.3.58, Plin. *Nat.* 24.102. It is elsewhere, as here, regarded as evocative of the pious past before the days of incense; cf. *Culex* 404 *herbaque turis opes priscis imitata Sabina.*

344 et non exiguo laurus adusta sono: laurel was used in a wide variety of different rites; cf. e.g. 4.742 (Parilia), Verg. *Ecl.* 8.82–3, Tib. 2.5.81–4, Fest. 104 L. *itaque eandem laurum omnibus suffitionibus adhiberi solitum erat*, Serv. *A.* 1.329. It is suitable in this context of simple offerings in view of the fact that it was a distinctly Italian

tree; cf. esp. Plin. *Nat.* 15.138 (the only tree to give its name to a Roman forename and location in the city). The litotes in *non exiguo . . . sono* draws attention to the (proverbially) loud crackling noise produced by the burning laurel; cf. Theoc. *Id.* 2.24, Lucr. 6.154–5 *nec res ulla magis quam Phoebi Delphica laurus/terribili sonitu flamma crepitante crematur*, Tib. 2.5.81, Plin. *Nat.* 15.135, Sen. *Nat.* 2.22.

345–6 "If there is anyone who, having made garlands from flowers of the meadow, could add violets to them, he was rich indeed": Ovid suggests that there was a different code of 'richness' during the Golden Age which was not based on financial means. It is an established conceit in moral discourse on ancient times, but Ovid here confines it specifically to the context of sacrifice by expressing it in terms of flowers for ritual garlands. The phraseology of the couplet implies that the people themselves went out to pick the flowers, arranged them (*violas addere*) and made the garlands (*factis . . . coronis*), and this fits the moralistic context. First, the making of things from readily-available materials is a sign of honest simplicity, see 200n. More specifically, the gathering of flowers is the archetypal pursuit of the chaste/innocent; cf. e.g. 4.431–42 (maidens), *Met.* 5.391–4 (Proserpina), Eur. *Hipp.* 71–4, 79ff. (Hippolytus), Cat. 64.278–84 (Chiron).

345 flore: the collective singular is a predominantly poetic usage; cf. 4.430, 432, 5.211, Lucr. 5.671, Tib. 2.1.59 *rure puer verno primum de flore coronam*, *Thes.* 6.1.928.59ff.

coronis: floral garlands are appropriate simple offerings to all deities; cf. e.g. 2.535–7 (Stygian deities), 2.643–4 (Terminus), 3.253–4 (Juno), 4.869–70 (Pales); for the history of the uses of the garland, see Bömer on 345.

346 violas: the violet fits the context of simplicity here, as it is regularly included in floral catalogues to demonstrate the variety of colour bestowed naturally by the earth; cf. 4.437, *Met.* 5.392, Verg. *Ecl.* 2.47, *Copa* 13–14 *sunt etiam croceo violae de flore corollae/sertaque purpurea lutea mixta rosa*, *Culex* 400, Petr. 127.9, Nisbet/Hubbard on Hor. *Carm.* 2.15.5. Ovid elsewhere demonstrates their specific usage in ritual; cf. 2.539 with Bömer ad loc. (a humble gift for the ghosts), 6.469 *at simul auritis violae demuntur asellis* (Vestalia).

347–8 Ovid's final detail that the sacrificial knife was not in use in the Golden Age leads neatly on to the first ever purported sacrifice (349ff.).

It has been suggested that the time evoked here is that of early Rome and the reign of Numa who, influenced by Pythagoras, practised no live sacrifice; see Le Bonniec ad loc., BNP II.154. But established

chronology works against this interpretation: we cannot accept that the forthcoming mythical episodes occur *after* the reign of Numa; cf. e.g. *Met.* 9.346–8, where the story of Priapus and Lotis occurs a long time before the Trojan War; see also 337–48n.

349–456 The History of Live Sacrifice

Ovid charts the history of sacrifice of a variety of animals: the pig (349–52), goat (353–60), cow (363–80), sheep (381–2), horse (385–6), hind (387–8), dog (389–90), ass (391–440) and birds (441–56). Ovid's reaction to the fates of the various animals takes on a progressive form. In the early cases, where the animal has caused particular offence to a deity, Ovid appears to accept the sacrifice as deserving punishment; see 350n. (sow), 361n. (goat), 381n. In later cases, he seems to become more ambivalent as to whether or not the sacrifice was deserved; see 363–80n. (cow). Later still, he seems to condemn the sacrifice in subtle ways; see 383–4n. (cow and sheep), 385–6n. (horse), 387–8n. (hind), 441–56n. (birds). As such, we are encouraged to view live sacrifice as an institution whose morals have degenerated through time.

i. *The Anti-Sacrifice Tradition*

In condemning (at least some instances of) animal sacrifice and showing sympathy towards animals—a pose anticipated by the focus on the animal's viewpoint in the initial list of etymologies (319–32n., 327n., 328n.) and by the suggestion that animal sacrifice is part of a morally degenerate age (337–8n.)—Ovid taps into a long-established anti-sacrifice tradition which is particularly associated with the philosophy of Pythagoras; see, in general, Sorabji (1993) 170–9, Gale (2000) 102–5.

Animal sacrifice and meat-eating (regularly conceptualised together) were typically considered unjust and immoral on the grounds that animals and humans were akin, and that human souls could be reincarnated into the bodies of animals. As such, the killing of animals was equated with human murder, and a life of complete vegetarianism and abstinence from animal sacrifice encouraged; for the Pythagorean lifestyle, cf. e.g. Cic. *N.D.* 3.88 with Pease ad loc., Iamb. *VP* 25, 35, Diog. Laert. 8.13, Macr. 3.6.2.

Criticism of live sacrifice was not, however, confined to the Greek philosophers. Ovid's Roman didactic predecessors also engage with this tradition: Lucretius (5.1198–1203) suggests that live sacrifice is a ceremonial anathema which is out of touch with true piety; Vergil in his *Georgics* employs several subtle tactics to undermine and question the validity of the practice (see Gale (2000) 105–12). Most importantly, Ovid himself offers a sustained attack on animal sacrifice and meat-eating, put into the mouth of Pythagoras, at *Met.* 15.75ff. Although Ovid makes no specific reference to Pythagoras in our section, the numerous verbal and thematic similarities between the two sections are striking, and encourage us to view this section with the Pythagorean episode in mind; for the similarities, see 349–52n., 350n., 351n., 353–60n., 353n., 361n., 362n., 380n., 383–4n. Lefèvre (1976) 57; for the issue of the relative chronology of the two passages, and the general case for reading *Metamorphoses* before *Fasti*, see Introduction, II and 1–2 (iv) n.

ii. *Live Sacrifice and Augustan Rome*

Ovid, then, is not the first to take a critical look at the institution of live sacrifice; what is striking, however, is the combination of his timing, the reign of Augustus, and the choice of forum, the poem *Fasti*.

First, there is the timing. During his reign, and the early years in particular, Augustus was keen to forge a sense of religious revival under the Principate as a favourable contrast to the 'religious neglect' of the late-Republic. Considered an effective means of achieving this sense of religious revival, animal sacrifice was given a high profile in Augustan Rome: note, in particular, the elaborate spectacle of live sacrifice at the Secular Games in 17 B.C. (BNP I.201–6, Feeney (1998) 28–38); the importance of the Emperor as leader of sacrifice (Gordon (1990)); the abundance of sacrificial imagery in Augustan iconography (Zanker (1988) 114–18, Kuttner (1995) 131–5). Secondly, there is the forum. In marked contrast to his predecessors in the anti-sacrifice tradition, Ovid in *Fasti* purports to deal specifically with Roman festivals, and quite literally celebrate imperial 'altars' (*Caesaris aras* (13)), the very stage for live sacrifice. The combination of these factors makes the inclusion of anti-sacrifice sentiment in *Fasti* a startlingly provocative move.

It should be noted that the poet's anti-sacrifice stance in this section is subtle and sporadic; it ultimately emerges as just one of a

number of guises that the poet can take up and put down at will; see especially 391–440, where Ovid becomes comic playwright (see 391–440 (i) n.). Nonetheless, Ovid lays the practice of animal sacrifice open to far more critical scrutiny than one might have expected from a singer of festal days.

349–52 The pig was the first animal to be sacrificed (cf. *Met.* 15.111–13 below), a tradition which may have resulted from or given rise to the etymological link between pig and sacrifice; cf. Var. *R.* 2.4.9 *sus graece dicitur* ὗς, *olim* θῦς *dictus ab illo verbo quod dicunt* θύειν, *quod est immolare.* The pig's offence was to spoil the corn, for which it was sacrificed to Ceres; cf. Hyg. *Fab.* 277.4, Serv. *A.* 3.118; cf. also Ael. *NA* 10.16. For good measure in *Fasti*, the pig presents itself as a further nuisance to Ceres when it prolongs her search for Proserpina by spoiling the footprints made by the princess (4.465–6).

The story is related in a linguistically straightforward manner by Pythagoras at *Met.* 15.111–13: *et prima putatur/hostia sus meruisse mori, quia semina pando/eruerit rostro spemque interceperit anni.* By contrast, 349–52 is loaded with very colourful language which raises the story's status to that of mini-epic. The offending sow is described in grand terms such that it resembles a savage boar, which evilly destroys corn in the prime of its life; see 351–2nn. Ceres is seen as a deity who rejoices in an act of bloody vengeance; see 349–50n. In this section, Ovid employs a wide variety of narrative modes to tell the different stories; see 353–60n. ('tragedy' of the goat), 393–440 ('comedy' of the ass).

In the process, Ovid introduces a major difference between the examination of animal sacrifice in our poem and *Metamorphoses.* In *Met.*, Pythagoras views live sacrifice as exclusively the sin of man, suggesting that the gods are blameless, and that man is misguided in his belief that gods appreciate it; cf. *Met.* 15.127–9 *nec satis est, quod tale nefas committitur: ipsos/inscripsere deos sceleri numenque supernum/caede laboriferi credunt gaudere iuvenci.* In our section, however, Ovid suggests that the gods are, at least on occasions, the original instigators of animal slaughter; cf. 376–8, 439, 445–6.

349–50 Ceres is represented here in unusual pose as an animal-killer, rejoicing (*gavisa*) in an act of vengeance (*ulta*). This directly contradicts the sentiment of Pythagoras that gods take no pleasure in slaughter (*Met.* 15.127–9, cited in 349–52n.). Similar images of Ceres are evoked elsewhere in Ovid, but they are intended to be viewed as grotesque; cf. *Am.* 1.1.9 *quis probet in silvis Cererem regnare*

iugosis (gods usurping the roles of other deities), 3.10.35ff. *diva potens frugum silvis cessabat in altis* (Ceres neglecting her proper duty).

349 prima Ceres: Ovid engages here in the popular pursuit of searching for the inventor (*protos heuretes*) of a particular practice or artefact; cf. e.g. Ar. *Prom.* 476–506 (Prometheus invents writing, arithmetic and ships), Hor. *Carm.* 1.3.12 with Nisbet/Hubbard ad loc., Tib. 1.4.59–60 with Maltby ad loc. The phraseology *prima Ceres* is elsewhere used to introduce Ceres' praiseworthy role as the first to teach man the art of farming, a more sophisticated means of sustenance; cf. *Am.* 3.10.11–14, *Met.* 5.341–3 *prima Ceres unco glaebam dimovit aratro,/prima dedit fruges alimentaque mitia terris,/prima dedit leges*, Verg. *G.* 1.147–9. Its usage here only serves to heighten the shock when we realise that Ovid is expressing Ceres' initiative in the more controversial sphere of animal sacrifice.

350 merita . . . nocentis: *merita* may simply represent Ceres' point of view. But it may also be the view of the 'poet', who concurs with his own Pythagoras that the sow in part deserved the punishment it received; cf. *Met.* 15.111–12 *prima putatur/hostia sus meruisse mori*, 115. Ovid starts his account with sacrifices which are at least partly justified before proceeding to those which he regards as unjustified (see 349–456n.).

opes is transferred to the agricultural sphere to express the 'wealth' of a certain produce; cf. 4.618 *vix congestas area cepit opes*, *Met.* 11.209, Verg. *A.* 8.316–17, *Thes.* 9.2.815.24ff. Here, it represents the point of view of Ceres, to whom the corn is her wealth.

351 sata vere novo teneris lactentia sucis "the crop, milky with its youthful juices in early spring": the text is problematic here as the MSS are split between *lactentia* (ω)/*lactantia* (**UMς**) and *latentia* (**A**), *sucis* (**Uς**)/*succis* (**Mς**) and *sulcis* (**Aς**). *teneris latentia sulcis* makes perfect sense but is unmetrical. It is the intertext of this section with Pythagoras' speech in *Met.* 15 which commends the present reading. Crops, particularly corn, are regularly described as 'milky'; cf. Enn. *Ann.* fr. 448 Sk. *fici dulciferae, lactantes ubere toto*, Lucil. 1198 Marx, Verg. *G.* 1.315, Prop. 4.2.14 *et coma lactenti spicea fruge tumet*, *Thes.* 7.2.850.56ff. *sucus* is elsewhere used of the vital fluid of plants (cf. e.g. Var. *R.* 1.40.4, Verg. *G.* 1.90, Sen. *Ep.* 95.59), and *teneris* would refer to its tender age (see *OLD* s.v. 2). The accumulation of adjectives here evokes a picture of the corn as young, full of vigour and in the prime of its life. These are exactly the same terms in which Pythagoras endearingly refers to youth; cf. *Met.* 15.201–2 *nam <u>tener</u>*

et lactens puerique simillimus aevo/vere novo est. By referring to the corn in this pathetic manner, a greater sense of outrage is felt when it is destroyed by the sow, and the animal may be viewed in an even more condemnatory light.

352 saetigerae "bristle-bearing": this grand compound is often used to enhance the menacing image of a savage boar; cf. *Met.* 8.376 (*saetiger* used as a noun for the Caledonian Boar), 10.547–9 *non movet aetas/nec facies nec, quae Venerem movere, leones/saetigerosque sues oculosque animosque ferarum,* Verg. *A.* 7.17. By using this epithet for the sow, Ovid perhaps encourages a hyperbolic impression of the animal as a menacing, life-threatening boar, and hence lifts the act of destruction on to a grander plane.

353–60 Ovid turns his attention to the plight of the goat, which was traditionally sacrificed to Bacchus on account of its eating the vine; cf. *Met.* 15.114–15 *vite caper morsa Bacchi mactatus ad aras/ducitur ultoris,* Var. *R.* 1.2.19, Verg. *G.* 2.376–81, Mart. 3.24.1–2. Whereas the story of Ceres and the sow was narrative of epic dimensions, the story of Bacchus and the goat unfolds as a drama, almost as a mini-tragedy. The initial reproach by a 'wiser' being (353–4), prophetic words unheeded by the perpetrator of a crime (355–8) and the inevitable disastrous ending (359–60) all bear the hallmarks of a tragedy. This dramatic framework helps to vary the manner of Ovid's presentation of material in this section (see 349–52n). However, the setting up of a tragedy about a goat is a particularly learned ploy, given that Bacchus is god of drama and that tragedy is believed to have taken its name from πράγος ('he-goat'), because a goat was the original prize offered at rustic drama contests; cf. e.g. Hor. *Ars* 220 *carmine qui tragico vilem certavit ob hircum* with Brink ad loc., Verg. *G.* 2.380–1, Tib. 2.1.55–8, Diom. 1.487.13 *tragoedia, ut quidam, a* τράγῳ *et* ᾠδῇ *dicta est, quoniam olim actoribus tragicis* τράγος, *id est hircus, praemium cantus proponebatur,* Isid. *Orig.* 8.7.5, Maltby 617 s.v.

353 sus dederat poenas: exemplo . . . huius: Ovid makes a connection between the Ceres and Bacchus episodes by suggesting that the sow's punishment set an example which the goat should have heeded. The similarity between the two episodes is often stressed, and hence they are grouped together; cf. *Met.* 15.111–15, *Pont.* 2.9.29–32, Serv. *A.* 3.118 *nam aut haec immolantur quae obsunt eorum muneribus, ut porcus Cereri, quia obest frugibus, hircus Libero, quia vitibus nocet.* The idiom *poenas do/luo* usually refers to human atonement for crime; cf. e.g. 4.321–2 *si tu damnas, meruisse fatebor;/morte luam poenas*

iudice victa dea (Claudia Quinta's appeal to the gods), *Met.* 9.579, *Ib.* 617–18, Sal. *Cat.* 52.31, *Thes.* 5.1.1665.11ff. For animal atonement, cf. 439 (ass).

355–8 The words of the warning in 357–8—"Gnaw the vine, goat! However, from this vine there will come something which can be sprinkled on your horns, when you stand at the altar"—are a very close adaptation of famous Greek verses by Evenos, which were found inscribed on a Pompeian fresco (see Gow on Theoc. *Ep.* 1): κἤν με φάγῃς ἐπὶ ῥίζαν ὅμως ἔτι καρποφορήσω,/ὅσσον ἐπισπεῖσαι σοί, τράγε, θυομένῳ (*Anthologia Palatina* 9.75). That these lines were famous can be illustrated by Suetonius' jibe towards Domitian. It was these two famous lines, written on leaflets, which were apparently sufficient to alarm the Emperor Domitian, ever nervous and plagued by thoughts of his own death, and compel him to nullify his recently-published edict on the cutting of vines; cf. Suet. *Dom.* 14. It is reasonable, then, to assume then that these lines were known to the Ovidian audience; hence they seem even more authoritative.

There is, however, a difference between the two couplets. In the epigram of Evenos, it is the vine which speaks, whereas in our section the words are attributed to an unnamed bystander (*aliquis*). This variation may be employed in an attempt to make the story more plausible. However, it does concur with Ovid's general tendency to avoid giving voice to inanimate entities in his poetry; see e.g. Galinsky (1975) 239–41 on the avoidance of the supernatural in the story of Turnus' attack on the ships of Aeneas (*Met.* 14.527–65); Rutledge (1980b) 325 (no inanimate interlocutors in *Fasti* unlike Callimachus' *Aetia*).

355 dentes . . . prementem: an apparently unique periphrasis for *mordere* (*Thes.* 5.1.541.21); for *dentes imprimere*, cf. Tib. 1.6.14, Sen. *Dial.* 7.20.6, Luc. 9.806, Juv. 9.134.

356 non tacito . . . dolore: to be taken with *aliquis* (355) to express the emotion with which the bystander speaks, i.e. "with considerably audible anguish".

359 verba fides sequitur "credibility (for what had been said) followed the words": Ovid is particularly fond of using *fides* to express the credibility gained from the fulfilment of a particular wish or prayer; cf. 475–6 *dixerat . . . multaque praeterea tempore nacta fidem*, 3.356, 366, *Pont.* 3.4.99, *Thes.* 6.1.673.29ff. The brevity of the phrase helps to convey the swiftness and inevitable progression from wish to fulfilment, and similar phrases are employed elsewhere by the poet; cf. 6.55 *dicta fides sequitur*, *Met.* 3.527 *dicta fides sequitur*, 8.711 *vota fides sequitur*.

noxae tibi deditus hostis: *noxae do* is a legal formula which means 'surrender to a plaintiff as compensation for a wrongdoing'; cf. Fest. 181 L. *lex iubet noxae dedere, pro peccato dedi iubet, OLD* s.v. 2b. The law comes into force when the injury is caused by a party which is not a full legal personality in its own right, such as, in this case, an animal; see D. Daube (1939–41), '*nocere* and *noxa*', *Cambridge Law Journal* 7, 23ff.; for Ovid's use of legal terminology, see 107n. For the transferral of *hostis* to the animal sphere, cf. e.g. *Met.* 1.507, Cat. 63.77, Verg. *A.* 12.253, *Thes.* 6.3.3064.59ff.

360 spargitur adfuso cornua, Bacche, mero: for the pouring of wine on a victim's head before sacrifice, see 720n. *spargitur . . . cornua* echoes *spargi cornua* in 358, emphasising the prophetic nature of the original warning in 357–8.

361 culpa sui nocuit, nocuit quoque culpa capellae "Guilt was damaging for the sow, guilt too was damaging for the (she-) goat": the chiasmus with double repetition here, a favourite of Ovid's, aptly expresses the common guilt of both parties, acknowledged elsewhere in similar language by Ovid's Pythagoras; cf. *Met.* 15.115 *nocuit sua culpa duobus*; for double repetition in chiasmus, cf. *Am.* 2.4.39 *candida me capiet, capiet me flava puella, Met.* 7.799, Wills (1996) 393. To achieve this stylistic effect, and perhaps also for added word play with *culpa*, the *caper* (354, 357) has been altered to a *capella.*

362 quid bos, quid placidae commeruistis oves? "Of what crime, ox, were you guilty, of what you, peaceful sheep?": by this interjection, the poet makes the transition from animals who have deserved their death (at least in part) to those who have not; see 383–4n. This sentimental address to the animals themselves recalls, in abbreviated form, Ovid's own Pythagoras; cf. *Met.* 15.116–21 esp. 116 *quid meruistis oves,* 120 *quid meruere boves.*

commeruistis: *commereo* is used here to express the guilt of a certain offence, a sense which, before Ovid, is confined to early comedy; cf. Pl. *Mos.* 516, Ter. *An.* 139 *quid commerui aut peccavi, Thes.* 3.1880.31ff.; for Ovid's fondness for verbs prefixed by *com-*, used especially to avoid repetition, see McKeown on *Am.* 2.4.3, Wills (1996) 441–3.

363–80 Ovid answers the first part of his question in 362 (*quid bos . . . commeruistis*) by telling the story of Aristaeus' successful regeneration of bees from the carcass of a bull. Lines 363–4 introduce us to the desperate situation of Aristaeus. In 365–70, Cyrene tells her son to seek the help of Proteus. In 371–8, Aristaeus follows the

advice and learns the means of restoring his bees, and a statement confirming the successful outcome finishes the account (379–80).

The belief that bees could be generated from the carcasses of cattle—a process known as *bougonia*—was well-established among the Romans; cf. *Met.* 15.364–7, Var. *R.* 2.5.5 *denique ex hoc putrefacto nasci dulcissimas apes, mellis matres, a quo eas Graeci bugenes appellant,* 3.16.4, Mynors on Verg. *G.* 4.281–314. Furthermore, Greek epithets for bees such as ταυροπάτωρ ('sprung from a bull' [Theoc. *Syrinx* 3]) and βουγενής ('born of cattle' [Call. 383.4 Pf.]) suggest a long-standing awareness of the practice. There is, however, no evidence of a mythological explanation of the phenomenon involving Aristaeus before the elaborate tale in the fourth book of Vergil's *Georgics.* One fundamental difference between the two versions is that Ovid sets up the Aristaeus myth to explain the slaughter of the first *bos,* performing a completely different function from the myth in Vergil, where we are given no reason to think that the bulls slaughtered (Verg. *G.* 4.548ff.) are the *first ever* to be killed. Nevertheless, apart from a few slight differences in detail, which might be explained in terms of his simplification of the Vergilian myth (see 371–2n., 376–8n.) or in terms of his version being directed to this new purpose (see 377n.), Ovid clearly relies on the reader's familiarity with Vergil, as the account here is very brief; see 363n., 365–6n. In fact, the continued emphasis in the story on Aristaeus' situation and desired outcome (363–4, 367–8, 376, 377–80), the abrupt transition between his meeting his mother and arriving at the seer (370–1), and the overall avoidance of excessive extraneous detail, mark Ovid's version out as distinctly perfunctory.

As lines 363–80 are so clearly based on Vergil, it would be helpful if we could first reach an understanding of the myth at the end of Vergil's *Georgics.* However, it is far from clear whether the restoration of the bees in Verg. *G.* 4 represents a positive or negative conclusion to the poem; for different interpretations and the history of the debate, see now Morgan (1999) 105ff., Gale (2000) 110–11. Since it is impossible to pin down the Vergilian myth, it is equally impossible to assess how Ovid is reacting to the story here. Ovid's version of the myth supports both a positive and negative reading. Given the apparent sympathy shown towards the *bos,* which is established both at the outset of the story (362) and at its conclusion (383–4), and the possible depiction of Aristaeus as a self-interested campaigner (see 363–4n.), one could argue for a negative reading of the *bougonia*

procedure here. Alternatively, we could see the final remark in 380—that one death gave rise to a thousand lives—as an endorsement of the *bougonia* procedure. Ovid appears to remain deliberately ambivalent to the issue.

On a structural note, it has been suggested that the myth as presented in Ovid is strictly out of place within a section on animal sacrifice, precisely because it deals with a *slaughter* rather than a *sacrifice* (no divine beneficiary is mentioned, as in most other examples in 349–456); see Lefèvre (1976) 46–7, Porte (1985) 45. However, Ovid is relying on the reader to recall the Vergilian myth to justify the story's inclusion in this section—at Verg. *G.* 4.532ff., the divine Nymph companions of Eurydice are recognised as the beneficiaries of the victims slaughtered by Aristaeus; see also 377n.

363–4 "Aristaeus was weeping because he saw that his bees, destroyed root and branch, had abandoned the combs on which they had begun work": in one sense, this couplet neatly recalls the myth in Verg. *G.* 4, where the story likewise commences with the lament of Aristaeus for the loss of his bees; cf. Verg. *G.* 4.317–19 *Aristaeus . . . / amissis . . . apibus morboque fameque,/ tristis*, 320 *multa querens*, 355–6 *tristis Aristaeus . . . / stat lacrimans*. We should, however, note the phraseology here. The actual killing of the bees is subordinated by a participle (*necatas*), whereas the main focus of Aristaeus' gaze, and by inference the main cause of his grief, is the abandonment and unfinished state of the honeycombs, a detail not found in Virgil. Ovid perhaps insinuates here that Aristaeus is more interested in the lucrative produce of the bees than the bees themselves, thus encouraging a picture of Aristaeus as a self-interested individual; for this impression of Aristaeus in the Vergilian model, see Thomas (1991) 218.

363 Aristaeus, traditionally recognised as the son of Cyrene and Apollo (cf. e.g. Pind. *Pyth.* 9.62–5, Ap. Rhod. 2.500ff.), became well-versed in a variety of agricultural skills, such as olive-growing, cheese-making and beekeeping, which he introduced to mankind; cf. Diod. Sic. 4.81.1ff., Plin. *Nat.* 7.199. As such, he is often viewed as a beneficial pioneer for mankind. On this occasion, however, he is mentioned in connection with the slaughter of the first oxen, a potentially less commendable invention.

cum stirpe: *stirps* literally refers to the stump and roots of vegetation, but it is regularly used, as here, in a metaphorical sense to evoke complete and utter devastation; cf. e.g. Sal. *Cat.* 10.1, Liv. 9.29.10, Tib. 1.8.45, Verg. *A.* 11.394–5 *Evandri totam cum stirpe videbit/procubuisse domum.*

necatas: Ovid here relies on his reader's knowledge of Vergil. Aristaeus' bees were, according to Cyrene, destroyed by Nymphs, who blamed him for the death of their companion Eurydice; cf. Verg. *G.* 4.457–9, 532–4 *haec omnis morbi causa, hinc miserabile Nymphae/ . . . exitium misere apibus.*

365–6 Aristaeus' mother Cyrene comforts her son before revealing the whereabouts of the divine seer Proteus, and the manner in which he may be compelled to offer assistance. Ovid's phraseology is distinctly editorial, encouraging us to recall the main sequence of events in Verg. *G.* 4. *quem . . . aegre solata dolentem* recalls Cyrene's effort in calming her distraught son by allowing him access to the fascinating abode of the river Nymphs and, at a feast, securing favourable omens which cheer his heart; cf. Verg. *G.* 4.357–86. Furthermore, Ovid suggests that the words of Cyrene that are offered in 367–70 are indeed the *ultima* of a longer stretch of conversation. This alludes to the more elaborate speech of Cyrene in Verg. *G.* 4, of which the detail about Proteus (Verg. *G.* 4.387–414) forms the last part.

365 caerula . . . genetrix: as a Nymph who resides in the river Peneus (cf. Verg. *G.* 4.355), Cyrene can fittingly be referred to as *caerula*, a standard poetic epithet for aquatic deities; cf. e.g. *Her.* 9.14 (Nereus), *Met.* 1.275 (Neptune), 2.8, 13.742 (Doris), Verg. *G.* 4.388 (Proteus), Hor. *Epod.* 13.16 (Thetis), Prop. 3.7.62, Van Dam on Stat. *Silv.* 2.2.21. Both *caerulus* and *caeruleus* are used by Ovid, with no difference in meaning, in accordance with metrical convenience; cf. e.g. 375 *caerulea . . . barba*, McKeown on *Am.* 2.11.12.

367 siste . . . lacrimas: a familiar type of opening remark which anticipates the speaker's offering of salvation; cf. 480 *siste . . . lacrimas*, 6.154 *sistite . . . lacrimas* (Cranae to the parents of Proca), *Met.* 14.835 *siste tuos fletus* (Iris to Hersilia).

368 quoque modo repares . . . dabit: *modus* here has been attracted into the relative clause (= *dabit modum quo repares*); for this poetic phenomenon, popular with Ovid, cf. e.g. 376 *qua . . . repares arte requiris* (= *requiris artem qua repares*), *Am.* 2.2.4 with McKeown ad loc., *Ars* 1.71–2, K.-St. II.289–90.

369–70 It was a traditional attribute of sea divinities to have the ability to change their appearance for a variety of reasons; cf. Thetis, to avoid the suitor Peleus (*Met.* 11.241ff., Pind. *Nem.* 4.62ff.); Achelous, to escape harm from Hercules (*Met.* 9.62ff., Hyg. *Fab.* 31.7); Proteus (*Met.* 8.730–7). More specifically, prophetic shape-changers needed to be constrained if they were to give advice; cf. 3.291–3 (Picus and Faunus), Hom. *Od.* 4.414–16 (Proteus), Verg. *Ecl.* 6.18–19 (Silenus),

G. 4.399–406 *vim duram et vincula capto/tende . . . verum ubi correptum manibus vinclisque tenebis/tum variae eludent species atque ora ferarum* (Proteus), Apollod. 2.5.11 (Nereus).

369 versis . . . figuris: *verto* in the sense 'transform' is predominantly poetic; cf. *Am.* 1.8.13–14 *hanc ego nocturnas versam volitare per umbras/suspicor et pluma corpus anile tegi*, [Tib.] 4.1.61, Luc. 3.189, Stat. *Theb.* 4.572–3.

370 geminas: *geminus* is regularly used of things which naturally occur in twos, particularly parts of the body; cf. 5.432 *habent gemini vincula nulla pedes, Pont.* 3.2.72 (hands), Verg. *G.* 4.300 (nostrils), *Thes.* 6.2.1742.47ff.

371–2 resolutaque somno/. . . bracchia: a slight variation from the Vergilian myth, in which Aristaeus attacks Proteus when he has just laid himself down; cf. Verg. *G.* 4.438–9 *vix defessa senem passus componere membra/cum clamore ruit magno.* Likewise, in the parallel Homeric episode, it is Proteus' prone position, rather than his dormant state, which affords the opportunity for onslaught; cf. Hom. *Od.* 4.453ff. Ovid has here simplified the Vergilian myth, such that it concurs with Cyrene's original advice to Aristaeus, that Proteus would be at his easiest to approach when asleep; cf. Verg. *G.* 4.404 *facile ut somno adgrediare iacentem.*

372 alligat "put in chains" (understanding *vincula* (370)): for the sense, cf. Cic. *N.D.* 2.64, Sen. *Ep.* 26.10 *una est catena quae nos alligatos tenet*, *Thes.* 1.1682.11ff.

aequorei . . . senis "the Old Man of the Sea": this phrase is not used by Vergil to describe Proteus; Ovid is here recreating in Latin the Homeric epithet for Proteus, γέρων ἅλιος (Hom. *Od.* 4.365, 384, 401).

373–4 Proteus tries to escape by adopting several guises, but, restricted as he is, finally admits defeat. The action is described in greater detail by Vergil, of whom there are clear verbal echoes; cf. Verg. *G.* 4.440–1 <u>*ille suae*</u> *contra non immemor* <u>*artis*</u>*/omnia* <u>*transformat*</u> *sese in miracula rerum*, 443–4 *victus/*<u>*in sese redit.*</u>

373 ille sua faciem transformis adulterat arte "that shape-changer transformed/corrupted his appearance by his own art": the text is intriguing here. As a starting point, the majority reading *transformis adulterat* (**AU**ς) may be preferable to *transformat et alterat* (**M**ω), on the grounds that the verb *altero* is extremely rare and only found in late Latin; cf. Cael. Aur. *Chron.* 2.8.115 (*Thes.* 1.1758.14ff.). However, the majority reading itself is a curious phrase. The adjective *trans-*

formis is possibly an Ovidian coinage, as the only other example quoted by Bömer on 373, *OLD* and Lewis/Short is at *Met.* 8.871–2: *ast ubi habere suam transformia corpora sensit,/saepe pater dominis Triopeida tradit* (Erysichthon selling his daughter). From the context of *Met.* 8.871, *transformis* is best translated 'able to transform', rather than 'transformed' (*OLD*, Lewis/Short). We should therefore take *transformis* here with *ille* (Proteus), perhaps, as I have suggested above, as a substantive.

The verb *adultero* is also intriguing. As it is recognised as a compound of *ad* and *alter*, it might be taken in its primary, neutral sense 'change (to another form)', but this would be the only usage of the verb in this sense (*Thes.* 1.883.58ff.). It might alternatively be taken in the more subjective sense 'corrupt', denoting a change from pure to impure state; cf. *Pont.* 4.10.59 *copia tot laticum, quas auget, adulterat undas*, Plin. *Nat.* 12.71 (myrrh), 23.33 (wine), *Thes.* 1.884.13ff. If so, we are presented with a novel picture of transformable gods as beings who become a corrupted amalgam the more they change shape. This striking view of transformation is perhaps the sort of ingenuity we might expect from a poet so keen on the concept of metamorphosis.

374 in sua membra redit: a typical Ovidian manner of expressing transformation back to an original state; cf. 112 *in faciem redii dignaque membra deo* with n. (Janus), *Met.* 3.474 *ad faciem rediit* (Narcissus), 4.231 *in veram rediit speciem* (Phoebus).

375 oraque caerulea tollens rorantia barba "raising his head which was dripping moisture from an azure beard": aquatic deities are regularly depicted with beard/hair dripping with water; cf. *Met.* 1.339 (Neptune), Stat. *Theb.* 9.413–15 (Ismenos), Sil. 4.659–60 (Trebia), Claud. *Olyb. et Prob.* 222–3 (Tiber), *Epith. Honor.* 145 (Triton), *Rapt.* 2.314–16 (Phlegethon). *roro* is here used intransitively to mean 'drip moisture', with an ablative denoting the place from where the moisture comes; cf. e.g. 5.661–2 *et subiit vivo rorantia saxo/antra*, *Met.* 1.339 *ut ora dei madida rorantia barba*. For *caerul(e)us* used of aquatic deities, see 365n.

376–8 Proteus answers Aristaeus by reiterating his original request (376), and then offering the solution (377–8); for the phraseology of 376, see 368n. The proceedings have been simplified from Vergil. It is Proteus who here sanctions the killing of the bullock, whereas in Vergil it is a two-stage process: Proteus informs him of the situation which led to the destruction of the bees (Verg. *G.* 4.445–527) and then Cyrene tells how the bees are to be restored (Verg. *G.* 4.530ff.). Secondly, unlike the Homeric and Vergilian episodes, where

the defeated Proteus at first feigns ignorance of the seeker's quest (Hom. *Od.* 4.462–3, Verg. *G.* 4.445–6) before revealing in detail all that is sought, Ovid's Proteus has no desire for an involved conversation. Despite the simplification, Ovid is keen to continue the emphasis on the active involvement of the gods in the deaths of animals; see 349–52n.

377 The most obvious difference between the story here and in Vergil is the number of animals killed. The procedure in Verg. *G.* 4 is much more extravagant and complex: four bulls and four heifers are to be sacrificed; then nine days later poppies and a black ewe are to be offered to Orpheus, and a calf to Eurydice (Verg. *G.* 4.538–47). This difference can be accounted for in terms of the differing role that the myth plays in Ovid. Since the story is set up to explain the death of the *first ever* bull (unlike in Vergil (see 363–80n.)), it is fittingly a single animal which Aristaeus kills. It fits the poet's design, whereby he consistently opts for the singular when describing the fate of a particular species; cf. 349 (*porca*), 354 (*caper*), 362 (*bos*), 381 (*ovis*), 385 (*equus*), 388 (*cerva*), 391 (*asellus*), 452 (*columba*), 453 (*anser*), 455 (*cristatus ales*).

obrue . . . tellure: Proteus insists that the slaughtered bullock be buried in the ground in order to regenerate the bees, and the instructions here are similar to those given by Ovid's Pythagoras; cf. *Met.* 15.364–6 *i quoque, delectos mactatos obrue tauros . . . de putri viscere passim/ florilegae nascuntur apes.* Vergil does not imply burial of the animal carcasses—they are left on the ground in the grove (Verg. *G.* 4.543).

mactati: *macto* is a religious term which usually denotes sacrifice to a deity; cf. e.g. 3.300 *huc venit et fonti rex Numa mactat ovem*, 4.336, 6.345, *Met.* 4.755, 8.685, 12.151, *Tr.* 4.2.35, Serv. *A.* 4.57, Maltby 358 s.v. Usage of this verb serves to remind us that the animals were sacrificed to specific deities in Verg. *G.* 4 (see 377n.).

379 pastor: Aristaeus is referred to as such at Verg. *G.* 4.317, the very first word of Vergil's narration of the myth.

fervent: elsewhere the compound *efferveo* is used to describe the phenomenon of creatures emerging energetically from a putrid source; cf. e.g. Lucr. 2.928–9 *cernimus . . . vermisque effervere terra,/intempestivos quam putor cepit ob imbris* (worms), Verg. *G.* 4.556 (bees from carcass).

380 mille animas una necata dedit "the death of one living being gave rise to a thousand lives": a final summing-up statement which appears to endorse the *bougonia* phenomenon as a statistically beneficial process. The viewing of the process in abstract terms, as new and different life sprung from death, recalls Ovid's Pythagoras,

who likewise highlighted the *bougonia* as one of the many instances of Nature's efforts to renew and vary living forms; cf. *Met.* 15.252–3 *rerumque novatrix/ex aliis alias reparat natura figuras*, 255–7 *nascique vocatur/incipere esse aliud, quam quod fuit ante, morique/desinere illud idem.* We might be equally justified, however, to detect a hollow ring to the sentiment, given the apparent sympathy shown towards the *bos* (362, 383–4). The episode finishes, therefore, on an ambiguous note; see 363–80n.

381–2 The sheep eats herbs which are sacred to rural deities, and the implication is that it was sacrificed to these gods as atonement. The story is not found elsewhere, though the scenario is very similar to that of the goat (353–60), and the vague references in the story to holy herbs (*verbenas*) and unspecified rural deities (*dis ruris*) suggest that this is an Ovidian innovation. It does however fit the context well: not only does it answer the second part of Ovid's introductory question at 362 (*quid placidae commeruistis oves?*), but the mention of rural deities anticipates the irony of 383–4, when we are reminded how much the sheep contributes to rural life when alive.

381 poscit ovem fatum (Uς): the personification of fate as an entity which demands a particular course of events is particularly at home in elevated literature; cf. e.g. 4.253–4 *sed nondum fatis Latio sua numina posci/senserat* (Venus' presence in Latium not yet needed), Verg. *A.* 7.272–3 *hunc illum poscere fata/et reor*, 8.477, Vell. 2.123.2, Sen. *Tro.* 352, Petr. 111.11, *Thes.* 6.1.362.55ff. It adds a note of solemnity to the sheep's fate. The alternate MSS readings *pascit ovis pratum* (Δς) and *pavit ovis pratum* (**M**ω) are very feeble and do not, unlike the other examples in this section, specify the *death* of the animal.

verbenas: we are informed from Servius that *verbena* properly refers to a specific sacred herb, but that the term was widely used to denote any type of hallowed plant; cf. Serv. *A.* 12.120 *verbena proprie est herba sacra, sumpta de loco sacro Capitolii . . . abusive tamen iam verbenas vocamus omnes frondes sacratas, ut est laurus, oliva vel myrtus. verbenae* regularly formed part of a floral offering to the gods; cf. *Met.* 7.242 *has ubi verbenis silvaque incinxit agresti* (Medea honours Hecate and Youth), Verg. *Ecl.* 8.65, Hor. *Carm.* 1.19.14 with Nisbet/Hubbard ad loc., 4.11.7.

improba "shamelessly": the last occasion on which it is suggested that an animal deserved its punishment, at least in part; see 350n., 361n.

383–4 The poet interjects a comment of his own in sympathy for the ox and the sheep. By his choice of epithets, attention is drawn

to the benefits these animals bestow when they are alive, thus arguing the animals' case along the same lines as his own Pythagoras. *laniger* (see 334n.) highlights the gift of wool which the sheep bestows on man; cf. *Met.* 15.116–19 *quid meruistis oves . . . pleno quae fertis in ubere nectar,/mollia quae nobis vestras velamina lanas/praebetis. ruricola*, first found in Ovid, here means 'land-cultivating' rather than 'dwelling in the country', and is used elsewhere of the animal; cf. e.g. *Met.* 5.479, *Pont.* 1.8.54. It helps to promote the popular idea that it was futile to kill the ox because it was a dedicated fellow-worker; cf. 4.413–16, *Met.* 15.122–4 *immemor est demum nec frugum munere dignus,/qui potuit curvi dempto modo pondere aratri/ruricolam mactare suum*, Var. *R.* 2.5.3, Ael. *VH* 5.14, Morgan (1999) 109–10.

383 animam . . . ponat "lays down its life": an idiom for death which is first found in Vergil; cf. Verg. *G.* 4.237–8 *spicula caeca relinquunt/adfixae venis, animasque in vulnere ponunt*, Prop. 2.13b.43–4 *atque utinam primis animam me ponere cunis/iussisset quaevis de Tribus una Soror*; cf. also Prop. 1.13.17 (*animam deponere*), *Thes.* 2.71.1ff.

385 "Persia appeases with a horse Hyperion clothed in rays of light": it is widely attested that the Persians sacrificed horses to the sun; cf. Xen. *Cyr.* 8.3.24, *An.* 4.5.34–5, Philostr. *VA* 1.31, Paus. 3.20.4. In the context of this section, Ovid is perhaps suggesting that the Persians were the *first* to sacrifice this animal.

radiis Hyperiona cinctum: there are two long-standing traditions regarding the name Hyperion. The more popular tradition establishes Hyperion as an epithet or synonym for the Sun itself, perhaps deriving from ὑπὲρ ἰών ('he who travels on high'); cf. e.g. *Met.* 8.565, 15.406–7, Hom. *Il.* 8.480 Ὑπερίονος Ἠελίοιο, *Od.* 1.24, Enn. *Ann.* fr. 571 Sk., *Culex* 101. It is clear from *radiis . . . cinctum* that Ovid follows this tradition here. The other tradition (followed occasionally by Ovid as well) has Hyperion as the father of the Sun by his wife Theia; cf. e.g. *Met.* 4.192, 241, Hom. *Od.* 12.176, Hes. *Th.* 371–4.

386 ne detur celeri victima tarda deo: the reason given for the sacrifice is one of correlation between god and offering—swift animal to a swift god—and a similar reason is expressed by Herodotus to account for equine sacrifice conducted by the Massagetae; cf. 1.216.4 τῶν θεῶν τῷ ταχίστῳ πάντων τῶν θνητῶν τὸ τάχιστον δατέονται; for alternative reasoning for this sacrifice, see Frazer on 385. Ovid here may also be levelling more general criticism at sacrifices by correlation.

celer is a common epithet for the horse (cf. e.g. *Rem.* 788, *Her.* 18.166, Hom. *Il.* 8.88) and may reflect the fact that both *equus* and

ὠκύς ('swift') are derived from the same root; see Maltby on Tib. 1.2.71.

387–8 "Because on one occasion a hind was sacrificed to the twin Diana as substitute for a maiden, today also a hind falls even though it acts as substitute for no maiden": this refers to the famous episode preceding the Trojan war, whereby the Greeks were detained by Diana at Aulis until the goddess was appeased by a virgin's blood. Iphigenia, Agamemnon's daughter, was chosen as the victim but, in some traditions, Diana swapped the maiden for a hind at the last moment; cf. *Met.* 12.24–38 esp. 32–4 *victa dea est . . . subposita fertur mutasse Mycenida cerva, Tr.* 4.4.67–8, Eur. *IA.* 1543ff., Paus. 9.19.6. An emphatic tension is set up here between *pro virgine* (387) and its periphrastic antithesis *pro nulla virgine* (388). By such phraseology, Ovid may be levelling a more general criticism at the practice of (mindlessly) following a religious act which was originally conducted due to the needs of a specific situation. See also Hardie (2002) 19.

387 geminae . . . Dianae: there are two main readings here, *geminae* (**U**) and *triplici* (**Mω**). *triplici* is acceptable in that it refers to Diana's traditional triple-form; cf. e.g. *Her.* 12.81 *per triplices vultus . . . Dianae, Met.* 7.94–5, 194, Verg. *A.* 4.511; for her cult name Trivia, see 389n. However, it is more likely that *triplici* emerged as a gloss for *geminae*, which was misunderstood: *geminae* refers to Diana's status as 'twin' of Apollo, alluded to in the last couplet in his role as Sun God.

389–90 "I have seen the Sapaei, and whoever else lives near your snows, Haemus, making an offering of the entrails of dogs to Trivia": dogs were sacrificed to Trivia (Hecate) by the Greeks, though the animal appears to have been a common sacrificial victim; for sacrifice to Hecate, cf. Paus. 3.14.9, Plu. *Mor.* 277a, 280c; for other dog sacrifice, cf. 4.905ff. (to Robigo), Plin. *Nat.* 29.58 (to goddess Genita Mana), Plu. *Mor.* 280b–d (Lupercalia), 290a (Spartans to Enyalius), Frazer on 389. In the light of these more famous examples, the poet's decision to relate a very obscure occurrence of the sacrifice among the Sapaei is intriguing.

The Sapaei, mentioned by Ovid only here, were a tribe in Thrace who receive scant reference elsewhere in ancient sources, and, even then, only amidst a catalogue of Thracian tribes; cf. Hdt. 7.110 (Xerxes marched through their land on his way to Greece), Str. 12.3.20, Plin. *Nat.* 4.40. The apparent obscurity of the tribe, together with the poet's own endorsement of what he relates (*vidi*), has encouraged scholars to view this couplet as post-exilic and as a reflection

of the poet's own personal experience during his journey to Tomis; see e.g. Wilkinson (1955) 267, Lefèvre (1975) 61. Ovid, after all, claims to have traversed Thrace on his way to Tomis on the Black Sea; cf. *Tr.* 1.10.23 *nam mihi Bistonios placuit pede carpere campos* (the poet recalls his journey), *Pont.* 4.5.3–6 *longa via est . . . cum gelidam Thracen et opertum nubibus Haemum . . . transieritis* (return journey directions from Tomis to Rome). Moreover, he became well-versed in the geography and peoples of the lands he encountered and, even though the Sapaei are not mentioned in his exilic poetry, several equally obscure Thracian tribes are; cf. *Tr.* 1.10.23 (Bistonii), 3.10.5 (Bessi), *Pont.* 1.8.15 (Odrysii).

Though 389–90 fits the geographical context of Eastern sacrifice—cf. 385–6 (Persia), 387–8 (Aulis), 389–90 (Thrace), 391–440 (Lampsacus)—there are some potential problems. First, in all other examples in 349–456, Ovid purports to explain the first ever sacrifice of a particular species of animal. Lines 389–90, however, are merely a reference to a contemporary practice, and there is no suggestion that Ovid expects us to imply that dog sacrifice originated from this remote tribe. Secondly, the plural (*canum*) is out of place in a section which otherwise concentrates on the fate of the *first* sacrificed animal of the species (see 377n.). Thirdly, unlike in the other examples, the poet gives no *reason* for the sacrifice. If this is indeed a post-exilic insertion from the well-travelled poet, it might help explain these apparent contextual difficulties.

389 vidi is a standard formula for the didactic writer, since the claim to personal experience helps consolidate his role as learned informer; cf. e.g. 2.27, 4.936 (dog-sacrifice at the Robigalia), Lucr. 4.577, 6.1044, Verg. *G.* 1.193, Van Dam on Stat. *Silv.* 2.1.22; A. La Penna (1987), "*Vidi*: per la storia di una formula poetica", *Laurea Corona: Studies in honour of Edward Coleiro*, Amsterdam, 108ff. In this instance, *vidi* might introduce a genuine personal experience (see 389–90n.).

Triviae: Trivia is a cult name for Hecate, which commonly refers to her capacity as guardian of the triple roads; cf. e.g. 141–2 *ora vides Hecates in tres vertentia partes,/servet ut in ternas compita secta vias*, Var. *L.* 7.16 *Titanis Trivia Diana est, ab eo dicta Trivia, quod in trivio ponitur fere in oppidis graecis*, Macr. 1.9.6. From here, it becomes a popular synonym for Hecate; cf. *Pont.* 3.2.71, Cat. 34.15, Verg. *A.* 4.511 with Pease ad loc., Bömer on 141; see also 387n.

391–440 Priapus and Lotis

In discussing the reason for the sacrifice of the ass, Ovid narrates in some detail the story of the unsuccessful amorous advance of Priapus on the nymph Lotis at a Bacchic festival. Lines 393–404 set the scene for the festival: the location, the guests and the copious supply of wine. A sensual description of the Nymphs (405–10) is followed by a description of the reaction of the male viewers, in particular that of Priapus towards Lotis (411–18). Lines 421–32 describe Priapus' dramatic nocturnal onslaught, which is thwarted at the last moment by the donkey's braying, an act which determines its eternal condemnation and sacrifice (433–40).

The only other reference to this story is in *Met.*, where the outcome of Lotis' flight from Priapus is her transformation into a flower; cf. *Met.* 9.347–8 *Lotis in hanc nymphe fugiens obscena Priapi/contulerat versos, servato nomine, vultus*; cf. also Serv. *G.* 2.84 (Lotis turned into a tree to avoid Priapus). It is, however, one of a number of stories which see a libidinous Priapus chasing a lover; cf. 6.319–48 (Vesta), Theoc. *Ep.* 3 (Daphnis), *Priap.* 33.1–2, Mart. 10.92.11–12 (Flora), Herter (1932) 86–9.

i. *Style and Sources*

This story is the first of three large-scale tales of rape failure which Ovid tells in the poem; cf. 2.303–58 (Faunus' failed rape of Omphale, explaining why the god hates clothing), 6.319–48 (Priapus' foiled attempt on Vesta to explain Vesta's favour for the ass). These three tales have intrigued scholars for a number of reasons. First, these are the only tales in all Augustan poetry which take a light-hearted look at the specific theme of sexual frustration. Secondly, all three stories are remarkably similar in their setting, dramatic build-up, narrative style and obscene climax; see individual nn. for specific comparison, but for summary correlations, see Fantham (1983) 203, Richlin (1992) 171.

These similarities have encouraged scholars to ask whether the episodes were influenced by any particular literary or dramatic genre. Common features such as an association with Bacchus (a Bacchic festival setting and/or participating members of his standard retinue),

phallic exhibition and laughter have led modern scholars to suggest specific influence from the Roman stage: New Comedy and, in particular, mime and (possibly) satyr-play; for important discussions on the sources for these Ovidian episodes, see McKeown (1979), Fantham (1983) 187ff., Barchiesi (1997) 238–51, Wiseman (2002).

Turning specifically to the present tale, there is some evidence to suggest that Priapus featured in Roman drama, as both a character in mime (August. *C.D.* 7.6) and as a prologue speaker in one of Afranius' comedies (Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.100). Moreover, the episode here draws regularly on motifs associated with the popular stage; see 414n., 421n., 423–4n., 436n., 437n. That said, it seems unlikely that Ovid is basing his tale entirely on a single (lost) dramatic source. For one thing, he draws on his earlier amatory poetry for some aspects, especially for the characteristics of the 'lover' Priapus and his beloved 'mistress'; see 405–6n., 409n., 417–20nn. For another, aspects of the story share similarities with the *Priapea*, a set of poems which may have been composed concurrently (early Empire) and may even have been connected to Ovid himself; for the problems in dating the corpus, and tentative connections with Ovid, see Hooper (1999) 26–30.

In short then, a range of sources are detectable in the story of Priapus and Lotis; any connection between this story and a dramatic version must remain tentative. Be that as it may, it is noticeable that Ovid structures his story as if it were a verse-equivalent of a mime show. First, the narrative is clearly demarcated such that it appears to follow, in general terms, the 'acts' of a play: detail about the guests in attendance at the festival, which serves as an introduction to the *dramatis personae*; the flirtation of the Nymphs; Priapus' attempt on Lotis; the humiliating climax which, appropriately for the finale to a 'play', ends with universal laughter. Secondly, in accordance with a mime, no words are spoken in this story; on the contrary, the entire story is one of character gesture and movement, centring round the prolonged nocturnal approach of Priapus (425–32).

ii. *Interaction with the story of Priapus and Vesta (6.319–48)*

The story of Priapus and Lotis has attracted particular interest in view of the fact that it bears striking similarities to the episode involving Priapus and Vesta at 6.319–48; see Fantham (1983) 201–9; Williams (1991) 196–200; Newlands (1995) 124–45; Frazel (2003) 76–84. In

an attempt to account for these similarities, some scholars have pointed to the unfinished nature of the poem, suggesting that in a fully revised work Ovid would surely have omitted one of the stories; see Frazer on 392, Wilkinson (1955) 253, Fantham (1983) 203. More recent contributions have, however, stressed the importance of interaction between the two versions. In particular, Newlands [(1995) 124–45] has put forward an interesting case for suggesting that, far from being indicative of an unfinished work, the two episodes work together to enhance our appreciation and understanding of the poem as it stands. Newlands sees the story of Priapus and Vesta as the most striking example in a series of themes in Book 6 which repeat themselves from Book 1; cf. 1.63–288, 6.101–30 (episodes involving Janus); 1.289–94, 6.733–62 (relationship between Jupiter and Aesculapius); 1.313–14, 6.727 (the constellation of the Crab); 1.461–586, 6.529–50 (Carmentis as prophetess); 1.637–50, 6.89–96 (Concordia). More specifically, she argues that the reappearance of themes in Book 6 challenges our expectations, in that they appear as almost a 'negative mirroring' of Book 1: for example, Janus the pacifist in Book 1 becomes the rapist in Book 6; Carmentis the accurate prophetess in Book 1 becomes inaccurate in Book 6. Likewise, the appearance of Vesta, the austere Roman goddess of chastity, within a flippant tale involving Priapus strikes a disjunctive note in the light of the more 'socially-compatible' intrigue between Priapus and Lotis in Book 1. For Newlands, not only do these systematic repetitions encourage us to take Books 1–6 as a poetic unit, but the negative mirroring in Book 6 acts as a complex closural device. Indeed, it is noticeable that the systematic repetition of events in our two stories only serves to draw attention to the fundamental differences between them, which tends to suggest that both were intended in the poem as important contrasting tales; see 395–400n., 405–10n., 417–20n., 435–8n.

iii. *Gauging the Augustan response*

It is particularly difficult to gauge the Augustan response to this farcical episode. It is important first to clear up some potential misconceptions.

First, the appearance of Priapus *per se* in this poem is not problematic. Priapus is a respected fertility deity who is worshipped in a number of capacities (see 391n.). Moreover, figures of similar character and

status to Priapus—such as Pan and Silenus—are proudly advertised by some noble Roman families as their exalted ancestors; see Crawford (1974) I.336–7, 346, 464–5, 467 (coinage of the Vibii Pansae and Iunii Silani), Wiseman (2002) 285.

Secondly, that the Priapus episode may be based on a stage performance, possibly a mime, is not necessarily problematic. For one thing, plays were typically performed on festival days; as such, Ovid can claim partial justification for inclusion of dramatic material within a poem dealing with the Roman festivals. More specifically, mime, despite its apparently 'vulgar' content, seems to have attracted high-profile enthusiasts and sponsors, including Sulla, Julius Caesar and Augustus himself; see McKeown (1979) 71–2.

Thirdly, the obscenity and nudity within this episode is not in itself problematic in this poem, as obscenity and nudity form an integral part of certain Roman festivals and state procedures, especially those concerned with fertility; cf. e.g. 2.281ff. (Lupercalia), 5.331ff. (Floralia), Dion. Hal. 7.72ff. (Roman triumph); see further O'Connor (1989) 30ff.

Despite all this, the Augustan reader might be forgiven for feeling a certain amount of unease. Stories designed to mock Priapus and emphasise his lewd qualities are indeed popular in literature from the Hellenistic period onwards, most notably in the Greek and Roman Priapic poetry. However, the reader might well be justified to ask what *that* type of story is doing in a purportedly Roman, nationalistic and religious poem; for the potential 'generic' unease caused by the inclusion of the satyrs in this poem, see Barchiesi (1997) 241–2. Indeed, the story, as it is presented here, celebrates no particular 'religious' or 'Roman' quality of Priapus: on the contrary, it is, ironically, a story of *failed* fertility. Moreover, in terms of the ongoing commentary on animal sacrifice, the story points up both the irresponsible nature of the deity and the complete innocence of the ass. This might be seen to contribute to the (subtle) criticism of animal sacrifice adopted by the poet in this section; see 349–456n.

391 caeditur et rigido custodi ruris asellus: the 'guardian of the countryside' is Priapus, whose statue was set up to ward off birds and thieves from the land (see 400n.); for similarly-phrased references to the god, cf. *Priap.* 1.5, 81.1, 82.4 *custos ruris*, Herter (1932) 207. *rigido*, an allusion to his erect phallus, is elsewhere used of the deity—cf. *Priap.* 4.1, 45.1 *cum quendam rigidus deus videret*—and aptly

reminds us of his sexual 'activeness' ahead of the forthcoming story.

Despite the widespread cult activity for Priapus, including at Rome (see Herter (1932) 256–61)), sacrificing the ass to the deity appears to have been exclusive to his native Lampsacus; for discussion, see Herter (1932) 264–7. For *asellus* as a poetic preference for *asinus*, see Axelson (1945) 44–5.

392 causa pudenda quidem, sed tamen apta deo: the story of Priapus and Lotis is introduced as being the result of a disgrace of the god, just as in the doublet story in Book 6; cf. 6.319–20 *praeteream referamne tuum, rubicunde Priape,/dedecus?*

393–4 The festival of Bacchus was celebrated every two years, and is expressed here as occurring at the *tertia . . . bruma* owing to the Romans' practice of inclusive counting; cf. *Met.* 6.587 *sacra . . . trieterica Bacchi*, 9.641–2, *Rem.* 593, Verg. *A.* 4.302–3. The most notable example of this festival was conducted by Bacchic women on Mount Parnassus; cf. Paus. 10.4.3.

393 corymbiferi (**AMω**) "bearing clusters of ivy berries": a suitable epithet for Bacchus given his special bond with ivy, which is supposed to have screened his cradle from the enemy Juno; cf. 3.769–70 *Nysiadas nymphas puerum quaerente noverca/hanc frondem cunis opposuisse ferunt.*

corymbifer is apparently not found elsewhere (*Thes.* 4.1081.7–8), but is in line with Ovid's fondness for using/coining compounds in—*fer*; see Bömer on 125. It is a slightly more difficult reading than *racemiferi* (**Uς**, only elsewhere attested at 6.483 and *Met.* 3.666) and creates rhythmic alliteration with *celebrabas*, which may be an attempt to evoke the sort of percussion music which traditionally accompanies Bacchus; for previous use of this technique for Bacchus, cf. *Met.* 4.29 *femineae voces inpulsaque tympana palmis* (Bacchic women), Cat. 64.259–64 esp. 259 *pars obscura cavis celebrabant orgia cistis*, 263–4 *cornua bombos/barbaraque horribili stridebat tibia cantu.*

394 bruma means (mid-)winter (163n.), which seems to be incompatible with the later (summertime) scene of an outdoor woodland festival with scantily-clad nymphs (405–10); see Bömer on 394, Lefèvre (1975) 53. Two main suggestions have been put forward to account for this. First, it is suggested that *bruma* be taken in a more general sense, synonymous with *annus*, of which this would be the first occurrence; cf. Man. 3.607 *per quinquagenas complet sua munera brumas*, Stat. *Theb.* 4.653, *Thes.* 2.2209.14ff. However, in all the examples above, *bruma* could still meaningfully be translated as 'winter'. Besides, the festival of Bacchus is indeed attested to have occurred in winter; cf.

Plu. *Mor.* 953d (the weather was so bad that the Bacchic women needed to be rescued from Parnassus); W. Guthrie (1954), *The Greeks and their Gods*, London, 178. Alternatively, *bruma* is explained away as a mark of careless revision. It is suggested that the Priapus and Lotis episode in Book 1 is a revised version of the story based on the Priapus and Vesta episode in Book 6; in elaborating the present scene in a later edition, Ovid overlooked the significance of his prior seasonal reference *bruma*; for this view of the chronology, see Lefèvre (1975) 50ff., Fantham (1983) 203ff. This suggestion, however, attaches too much significance to a single word. It might be best to follow the conciliatory remarks of Newlands [(1995) 128 n. 13], who suggests that the gods were powerful enough to create their own climate, regardless of the season.

395–400 Ovid highlights six types of guest in attendance at the festival. Lines 395–6 describe the guests in general terms (as divine and lewd) before moving to the specifics: youthful bands in the form of Pans (397), Satyrs (397) and nymphs from the country and rivers (398), followed by the aged individuals, Silenus (399) and Priapus (400).

All characters here are compatible with a festival of Bacchus. First, Silenus and the Satyrs are traditionally regarded as part of the god's entourage; cf. e.g. 3.735ff., *Ars* 1.541–4, *Met.* 4.25ff., 11.89ff., Cat. 64.251–64 (the pluralised *Sileni*). To this entourage, Ovid has added the Pans and the Nymphs, who, as woodland deities, are naturally compatible with a woodland festival; cf. e.g. *Her.* 4.171–4, *Met.* 1.192–5, Lucr. 4.580–9, Verg. *G.* 2.493–4. Priapus too is occasionally found in this company (cf. *Met.* 14.637ff.), which reflects the tendency to syncretise Priapus with Bacchus and Pan; for identification with Bacchus, as either his son or tutor, cf. e.g. Str. 13.1.9, Tib. 1.4.7 *Bacchi . . . rustica proles*, Petr. 133.3 *Nympharum Bacchique comes . . . Bacchi tutor*, Paus. 9.31.2, Herter (1932) 62–5, 303–6; for identification with Pan, cf. *Anth. Graec.* 6.232, 9.338, *CIL* 14.3565.33–5 *O Priape potens amice, salve,/seu cupis genitor vocari et auctor/orbis aut physis ipse Panque, salve.*

There is no tension, therefore, in the arrival of this group at the woodland festival of Bacchus. This is in marked contrast to the doublet story in Book 6 where, we are told, at least one guest is not welcome; cf. 6.324 *Silenus, quamvis nemo vocarat, adest.* This indicates a fundamental difference between the two stories: in our story, the group is invited, and as such their lewd conduct among themselves can be viewed with amusement within a mythical context; in Book 6, the

more flippant members are not felt to be socially compatible with the noble divine guests of Cybele's feast (6.321–2), and their subsequent conduct produces a sense of outrage; see also 391–440 (ii) n.

395 in idem, here in the sense 'into the same place', is a colourless phrase which takes its meaning from the context; cf. [Ov.] *Ep. Sapph.* 121 *non veniunt in idem pudor atque amor* ('into the same place' [metaphorically]), Man. 1.128 ('into the same form'), Sen. *Ben.* 2.29.2 ('into the same being'), *Thes.* 7.1.189.2ff.

Lyaei: Lyaeus is a cult name for Bacchus meaning 'Loosener (from care)', derived from λύω. It alludes to the effect that his principal gift, wine, can have on the body, with the result that Lyaeus is often used as a metonym for *vinum*; for Lyaeus as a cult name, cf. e.g. *Am.* 3.15.17, *Met.* 4.11, Serv. *A.* 4.58 *dictus Lyaeos* ἀπὸ τοῦ λύειν, *quod nimio vino membra solvantur*; as a metonym for wine, cf. e.g. 5.521, *Ars* 3.645, 765, Hor. *Epod.* 9.38. Use of the cult name here anticipates the god's later role as provider of the festival wine (403), which spurs on the subsequent lewd conduct.

396 et quicumque iocis non alienus erat "and anyone who was not adverse to sexual play": the simple emendation of *locis* (**Aς**) to *iocis* avoids the (needless) repetition of ideas with *in idem* in the previous line. It also highlights the guests' wanton tendencies, as *iocus* is often used to refer to sexual activity; cf. e.g. 5.332, *Ars* 1.353–4 *videto,/neve parum tacitis conscia fida iocis* (know your lover's handmaid), 3.580, Nisbet/Hubbard on Hor. *Carm.* 1.2.34. Moreover, it is a key demarcating term for the more vulgar episodes in *Fasti*; cf. 2.304 *traditur antiqui fabula plena ioci* (Faunus and Omphale), 6.320 *est multi fabula parva ioci* (Priapus and Vesta).

397 Panes: Pan is a traditionally rural deity (cf. e.g. *Met.* 11.153ff.), but his pluralisation is entertained elsewhere; cf. *Her.* 4.171, *Met.* 14.638, Prop. 3.17.34. The multiplication of singular deities appears to have been a very common exercise in literature, and Ovid is quite happy to acknowledge both singular and plural manifestations of such demi-gods; cf. 412 with n. (Pan); also Faunus (2.306), the Fauni (*Met.* 1.193). The apparent ease of multiplication may be due to the sort of deity duplication witnessed on art forms such as vases; see Fantham (1983) 188. In the context of 397–8, the pluralisation of Pan and other deities has the effect of creating a suitably flippant gathering without laying emphasis on individuals; the spotlight is thus given to the two important characters who will motivate the story:

the lustful Priapus, and Silenus, the owner of the unfortunate donkey.

in Venerem Satyrorum prona iuventus: the Satyrs were standard members of the entourage of Bacchus; see 395–400n. *Venus* is a well-established metonym for sexual passion; cf. e.g. *Am.* 2.4.40, 2.8.8, *Met.* 10.434–5 *perque novem noctes Venerem tactusque viriles/in vetitis numerant*, Lucr. 4.1235, Prop. 4.7.19, *OLD* s.v. 4. *pronus* here expresses inclination—'the youthful band of Satyrs who are disposed to sexual passion'—with the intended course of action introduced by *in*; cf. Hor. *Ep.* 1.18.10 *alter in obsequium plus aequo pronus*, Liv. 42.59.10, Luc. 1.292.

398 The female members of the divine party are mentioned here and form part of the elaboration of *quicumque iocis non alienus erat* (396). This suggests straightaway that both male and female guests are equally licentious; see also 395–400n.

399 Silenus is a constant attendant of Bacchus (see 395–400n.) and father of the Satyrs, and is typically found in a comic setting. He is often, as here, depicted as a weak, elderly character (half-animal) riding a suitably old pathetic donkey; cf. e.g. 3.745–9, *Ars* 1.543–4, *Met.* 4.26–7 *quique senex ferula titubantes ebrius artus/sustinet et pando non fortiter haeret asello*, Sen. *Oed.* 429–30. He is given a comic episode to himself later at 3.735ff., where his attempt to gain honey from the bees is amusingly foiled.

400 quique ruber pavidas inguine terret aves "and the red one who frightens quaking birds with his phallus": a reference to Priapus, who was worshipped as a fertility god and originated in Lampsacus on the Hellespont. Statues of him were erected in gardens to repel birds and thieves, and it is this function of the god to which Ovid alludes here; see O'Connor (1989) 23–5; for statues of the deity showing his huge phallus, see *LIMC* VIII.2 s.v. 'Priapos' 6, 13, 22, 28, 100, 153.

That it is his *inguen*, his traditionally huge phallus, which terrifies the birds is, however, an unusual touch: this is usually the task of his reaping-hook; cf. Tib. 1.1.17–18 *ruber custos . . ./terreat ut saeva falce, Priapus, aves*, Verg. *G.* 4.110–11, Col. 10.32–4; or else his reed crown, cf. Hor. *S.* 1.8.6–7. Instead, his *inguen* is normally the object of fear to *humans*, who would fear sexual violation; cf. *Met.* 14.640 (thieves), Hor. *S.* 1.8.4–5 *nam fures dextra coercet/obscenoque ruber porrectus ab inguine palus*, Col. 10.32–4 (boys). The focus on his *inguen* here undoubtedly serves to forewarn us of his sexual tendencies, as it will be quite literally the centre of attention at the amusing climax to the story; see 437n.

ruber: statues of Priapus were painted red; cf. e.g. 415, 6.319 *rubicunde Priape*, Hor. *S.* 1.8.5, Tib. 1.1.17, *Priap.* 1.5, 26.9, Herter (1932) 172; for the painting red of other gods' images, cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 10.27 (Pan), Plin. *Nat.* 33.111. The colour is particularly fitting for Priapus, as the phallus itself, his chief asset, was typically depicted as red; cf. *Priap.* 83.6–8 *placet, Priape, . . . / ruber sedere cum rubente fascino?*, Mart. 2.33.2, Richlin (1983) 67, 116. For the colour contrast between assailant and victim, see 427n.

401 dulcia qui dignum nemus in convivia nacti "With a view to sweet festivities, they came across a suitable grove": *Thes.* 5.1.1148.19ff. suggests that this is a rare example of *dignum* taking *in*. However, the obscurity of the idiom, and the fact that the one other example cited—Cic. *Quinct.* 94 *qui maeror dignus inveniri in calamitate tanta potest?*—involves *in* taking the ablative, works against this idea. It is best to understand *in* in the sense 'with a view to'; cf. e.g. *Am.* 1.6.14, Prop. 3.18.18 *stantiaque in plausum tota theatra iuvent*, Verg. *A.* 7.13.

402 gramine vestitis . . . toris: a hint of etymological play here, given that *torus* was popularly believed to have been derived from *tortis herbis*; cf. Serv. *A.* 5.388, Isid. *Orig.* 20.1.2.

403 vina dabat Liber: Liber is a well-established cult-name for Bacchus; cf. e.g. 3.465, 479, 508, *Met.* 3.520, 4.17, Enn. *Trag.* fr. 186 J., Verg. *G.* 1.7. However, Liber fits the description particularly well here, as it is sometimes etymologically linked with unlimited (*libere*) consumption of wine; cf. Fest. 103 L. *repertor vini ideo sic appellatur, quod vino nimio usi omnia libere loquantur*, Isid. *Diff.* 1.349, Maltby 337 s.v.

404 miscendas parce rivus agebat aquas "a river was bringing forth water, to be mixed sparingly (with the wine)": *parce* (**Uς**) is much less well attested than *large* (**AMω**). Those that read *large* tend to understand it with *agebat* to emphasise the abundance of the water supply afforded by the stream; cf. Frazer "a stream supplied water in plenty to dilute the wine", Schilling. This is certainly viable, and would emphasise the worthiness (401 *dignum*) of the grove for such festivities. However, given the word order, it seems more appropriate to take the adverb (whichever we adopt) closely with the immediately preceding *miscendas*, so as to form a subordinate clause before the caesura. If we take the adverb with *miscendas*, then *parce* fits better: the god of wine allows some dilution of his liquid, but only just enough. *parce* is preferable both on the grounds of phrase articulation and because it would represent a light-hearted comment on the god's

bibulous nature, which is in line with Ovid's mood in this section.

405–10 Ovid proceeds to describe the appearance of the various Nymphs present. His account of their physical attributes and mannerisms progresses, broadly speaking, down the body: from their head (405–6) to various parts of their midsection (407–9) to their feet (410). This is the standard technique in the cataloguing of charms; cf. *Am.* 1.5.19–22 with McKeown ad loc., 3.1.7–14 (Tragedy and Elegy), Hor. *Epod.* 8.3ff. (catalogue of faults), Lucian *Am.* 14, Auson. *Ep.* 13.44ff.

The poet is aiming to highlight the sexual attraction of the Nymphs, and in places draws directly on the sort of female seductive tactics which he advocates for women in *Ars* 3; see 405–6n., 409n. This sensual description is instrumental to the story. The poet is keen to establish that it is precisely the nymphs' appearance and gestures which spur on the subsequent sexual arousal of the males. We should note the causal connective *hinc* (411), and the way in which Ovid points up the responsibility of the nymphs by portraying them as active donors of the flames of love; cf. *aliae . . . incendia mitia praebent* (411), *urunt* (413). As far as Ovid is concerned, the female nymphs, already highlighted as *non alienae iocis* (396, 398), are acting in a deliberately provocative manner by revealing parts of their body or wearing their garments loosely. As such, we are invited to view the subsequent reaction of Priapus as natural.

This is not the case in the story of Priapus and Vesta in Book 6. Though there is a seemingly similar focus on different groups of guests at the festival of Cybele at 6.327–32, there are two marked differences. First, at least some of the guests described are male (6.327 *hi*, 329 *hi . . . hos*). Secondly and more importantly, there is no sign of sexual provocation on the part of any of the guests; Ovid describes their actions, not their physical attributes. Vesta herself is simply resting, minding her own business; cf. 6.331–2 *Vesta iacet placidamque capit secura quietem, / sicut erat, positum caespite fulta caput.* Consequently, Priapus' rape attempt appears totally unprovoked, and puts the blame firmly on him: note the connective *at* in 6.333, which suggests that Priapus acted *despite* the unassuming character of Vesta. We are once again encouraged to draw a distinction between the two parallel stories: the actions in our story appear natural and light-hearted, whereas those in Book 6 are riddled with tension and outrage; see also 391–440 (ii) n.

405 Naides, literally 'water-nymphs', may refer exclusively to *quae*

colunt amnes (398). But the distinction seems pointless: it may be better to take *Naides* as denoting the Nymphs in general; cf. e.g. 4.231–2, *Met.* 1.691, 3.506, 10.514.

405–6 effusis . . . sine pectinis usu, . . . comis: the unkempt look is a standard trait of a female Bacchic worshipper, who is accustomed to tossing her head wildly; cf. *Am.* 1.14.21, *Met.* 4.6, Cat. 63.23, Verg. *A.* 7.394, Dodds on Eur. *Bacch.* 862–5. It also sounds an erotic note here, as unattended hair is often highlighted as a charming feature for a woman, significantly by Ovid himself; cf. *Am.* 1.14.19–21 *saepe etiam nondum digestis mane capillis . . . tum quoque erat neglecta decens* (Corinna), *Ars* 3.153 *et neglecta decet multas coma, Met.* 2.411–13 (Callisto), Ter. *Ph.* 106, Tib. 1.8.15–16, Prop. 4.8.51–2.

406 positis arte manuque comis "with hair arranged by a skilful hand": styled hair is also an attractive feature in certain women, and Ovid lists a range of styles at *Ars* 3.135–68 (see Gibson ad loc.).

407 illa super suras tunicam collecta ministrat "that one waits upon the guests with tunic gathered above her calves": the girt-up robe is the traditional attire of any type of attendant; see 319n. A revealing of the calves is a gesture which invites sexual interest; cf. e.g. Cat. 64.129 *mollia nudatae tollentem tegmina surae* (part of Ariadne's dishevelled look which attracted Bacchus), Prop. 2.19.15–16 *protinus et nuda choreas imitabere sura;/omnia ab externo sint modo tuta viro* (a seductive rustic practice which Cynthia might adopt), Auson. *Ep.* 13.47. Though Ovid does not evoke the same image elsewhere in his poetry, it fits his general keenness to point up the sexual attraction of the legs; cf. e.g. *Am.* 3.2.27–8, *Ars* 1.155–6, 3.775ff.

tunicam is accusative of respect with *collecta* (as is *pectus* with *aperta* in 408). This largely poetic idiom is predominantly used to denote clothing; cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 6.75, *A.* 2.393, 4.518 *unum exuta pedem vinclis*, H.-Sz. 36–7.

408 dissuto "unstitched": *dissuo* is a very rare verb, used literally here but found elsewhere in various metaphorical senses; cf. Cic. *Lael.* 76 *amicitiae . . . ut Catonem dicere audivi, dissuendae magis quam discindendae* (advocating a gradual break-up of friendship), Pers. 3.58–9 (an extremely gaping jaw), *Thes.* 5.1.1508.81ff. The vivid image produced here of a Nymph who has ripped her own clothing (or at least chosen to wear ripped clothing) only emphasises the wanton tendencies of the females at this festival.

409 exserit haec umerum: the revealing of the shoulder is a recognised way of arousing sexual attraction, and Ovid himself

specifically alerts his female audience to the tactic; cf. *Ars* 2.504, 3.307–10 *pars umeri tamen ima tui, pars summa lacerti/nuda sit*... *hoc ubi vidi,/oscula ferre umero qua patet usque libet*; cf also *Am.* 1.5.19 (charm of Corinna), *Met.* 1.501 (Daphne), Hor. *Carm.* 1.13.10, 2.5.18, Tib. 1.5.43.

410 impediunt teneros vincula nulla pedes: *vincula* is often used to denote some form of footwear; cf. e.g. 2.324, 5.432, *Am.* 3.1.14, Verg. *A.* 4.518, 8.458, Tib. 1.5.66. The nudity of feet is elsewhere evoked as a sensual image; cf. e.g. 4.426 (depiction of Proserpina and her companions), *Ars* 1.530 (becoming quality of Ariadne), Ter. *Ph.* 106.

411 hinc aliae Satyris incendia mitia praebent: for the implication on the story of the causal connective *hinc* and the Nymphs as subject of the sentence, see 405–10n. *incendium* is used metaphorically to evoke the well-established flame of love motif; cf. *Her.* 16.123, 20.121 *serventur vultus ad nostra incendia nati* (Acontius to Cydippe), *Ars* 2.301, Pl. *Mer.* 590, *Thes.* 7.1.863.64ff.; for the flame of love motif in general, see Pease on Verg. *A.* 4.2. However, the combination with *mitis* has no precedent, and is as such a novel oxymoron ('gentle conflagrations') to evoke the traditional antitheses of the emotion.

412 pars tibi, qui pinu tempora nexa geris: the reference here is to Pan, who is traditionally connected with pine, which he wears on his head; cf. e.g. *Met.* 1.699 *Pan*... *pinuque caput praecinctus acuta*, 14.638, Lucr. 4.586–7, Prop. 1.18.20. The singular deity is specified here (*tibi*... *geris*) whereas we were introduced earlier to pluralised *Panes* (397); for singular and multiple conceptions of such deities, see 397n.

413 inexstinctae Silene libidinis "O Silenus with your unquenchable lust": *libido* is used of raw sexual desire, lust; cf. e.g. *Am.* 2.15.25, *Ars* 1.281, *Met.* 6.458, 562, Lucr. 4.1045–6 *inritata tument loca semine fitque voluntas/eicere id quo se contendit dira lubido*. *inexstinctus* is first found in Ovid (*Thes.* 7.1.1333.30ff.). It is used by Ovid both literally to describe the perpetual fire of Rome (3.428, 6.297), and metaphorically of the insatiability of Erysichthon's hunger (*Ib.* 424) and the undying fame of Penelope (*Tr.* 5.14.36). Continuing the fire of love motif in this section (cf. *incendia mitia* (411)), Ovid is expressing Silenus' lust as an unquenchable fire, which is only stoked higher by the Nymphs' actively burning him (*urunt*); see also 405–10n.

urunt: *uro* is used in poetry to express the burning desire of love/lust; cf. e.g. *Her.* 7.25, Cat. 72.5, Verg. *Ecl.* 2.68, *A.* 4.68 *uritur infelix Dido*, Hor. *Carm.* 1.19.5. However, the more striking image we find here, whereby the beloved is grammatically the subject, actively

burning the lover, is more novel; cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 8.83 *Daphnis me malus urit*. By such phraseology, Ovid suggests a more deliberate intention on the part of the women to arouse the males.

414 nequitia est quae te non sinit esse senem "it is wantonness which prevents you from being an old man": *nequitia* is best translated here as 'sexual wantonness'; cf. *Her.* 4.17 *non ego nequitia socialia foedera rumpam* (Phaedra to Hippolytus), *Am.* 3.14.17, *Ars* 2.392, Prop. 3.10.24, 3.19.10. Sexual activity among the aged was often looked upon with contempt by the Roman love poets, particularly Ovid and Tibullus, who tended to regard it as a preserve of the young; cf. *Am.* 1.9.4 *turpe senilis amor*, Tib. 1.1.71–2 *iam subrepet iners aetas, nec amare decebit,/dicere nec cano blanditias capite*, 1.2.91–6, Stroh (1991). By contrast, sexual activity in old men was a common source of amusement and derision in Roman comedy; see e.g. Pl. *Cas.* (Lysidamus), *As.* (Demaenetus), Duckworth (1952) 245–7, Stroh (1991) 268–9. Therefore, the fact that Ovid looks upon old Silenus' sex life without resentment—even passing a light-hearted compliment on his youthfulness—sets the story within the ethical framework of a comedy; for a similar joke, cf. *Met.* 14.639 *Silenusque suis semper iuvenalior annis*. The light-hearted comment also establishes Silenus as an acceptable guest at this festival, very different from his reception in the story of Priapus and Vesta at 6.324; see 391–440 (ii) n.

415 hortorum decus et tutela "honour and protector of gardens": Priapus is elsewhere acknowledged as holding guardianship over gardens; cf. e.g. Verg. *G.* 4.111 *servet tutela Priapi*, *Priap.* 72.1 *tutelam pomarii, diligens Priape, facito*. But Ovid's epithets for Priapus here have a distinctly elevated feel, as the ideas of honour and guardianship are often collocated to form a eulogy to a grand individual or entity; for *decus* with *tutela/tutamen*, cf. *Met.* 12.612 *decus et tutela Pelasgi* (Achilles), Hom. *Il.* 3.229, 9.673, Cat. 64.323–4 *o decus eximium magnis virtutibus augens,/Emathiae tutamen* (Peleus), Verg. *A.* 5.262, *Laus Pis.* 243–4, Apul. *Pl.* 1.12; *decus* and *columen*, cf. Hor *Carm.* 2.17.4; *decus* and *praesidium*, cf. Lucr. 2.643, Hor. *Carm.* 1.1.2 with Nisbet/Hubbard ad loc. The application of such a formula to Priapus is mock-pompous given his subsequent conduct and humiliation (cf. *pudenda* (392)).

417–20 Ovid proceeds to express Priapus' infatuation with the nymph Lotis, his initial attempts to woo her and his subsequent rejection by her. The scene draws on many of the motifs of love elegy, as Priapus is seen in the amusing guise of coy lover and Lotis

as the haughty mistress; see individual nn. Given the poet's former role as elegiac lover, we can suspect that Ovid is here encouraging initial sympathy for Priapus who, having been led on by provocative dress and mannerisms, is now being spurned by a proud woman.

In marked contrast in the doublet story in Book 6, Vesta gives no such amorous signals to Priapus. Part of the reason for this, it has been suggested, is that Vesta was not only a symbol of chastity but also a Roman goddess without any standardised physical attributes: Ovid, then, could hardly depict her as a sexually-forthcoming personality; see Fantham (1983) 204ff., Newlands (1995) 133–4. Nevertheless, Ovid's portrayal does serve to absolve Vesta from any blame and put the onus squarely on the lecherous Priapus. In Book 6, Priapus dispenses with any subtle formalities and gets straight to his sexual business (6.337ff.). The attempted assault is therefore a highly disgraceful act, and the blow is hardly softened by Ovid's suggestion that Priapus may not have realised the identity of his victim (6.335–6); see also 391–440 (ii) n.

417 hanc cupit, hanc optat, sola suspirat in illa: as a reflection of the state of mind of Priapus, the line centres exclusively on the Nymph (anaphora of *hanc, sola . . . illa*). The swift succession of verbs (five in this couplet) is a standard Ovidian strategy to express the spontaneity of love, and the rapid shifts in thought and behaviour which are experienced by the love-struck; cf. e.g. 3.21 *Mars videt hanc visamque cupit potiturque cupita* (Mars for Silvia), 4.445 (Dis for Proserpina), 6.119–20 (Janus for Cranae), *Met.* 1.490–1 *Phoebus amat visaeque cupit conubia Daphnes,/quodque cupit, sperat* (Apollo for Daphne), *Met.* 4.316 (Salmacis for Hermaphroditus). *suspiro* takes the sense 'sigh longingly' (cf. e.g. Hor. *Carm.* 3.7.10), and the object of longing is elsewhere introduced by *in* + ablative; cf. Cat. 64.98 *in flavo saepe hospite suspirantem* (Ariadne for Theseus). The idea of gently sighing for a loved one befits a coyer lover than the animalistic Priapus. This commences an amusing portrayal of Priapus as a lover who follows (at least in the initial stages) the rules of social etiquette; see also 418n. For the common disregard for changes in pronoun in Ovid (*hanc* to *illa*), cf. *Am.* 1.9.20 with McKeown ad loc., 3.7.43, *Tr.* 4.10.53, *Thes.* 7.1.346.50.

418 signaque dat nutu sollicitatque notis: the acts of nodding (*nutu*) and making marks (*notis*) are traditional forms of communication between secret lovers. Fittingly, the motif finds its origin in comedy; cf. e.g. Naev. *Tarentilla* fr. 76 Ribbeck, Pl. *As.* 784 *neque illa ulli homini nutet, nictet, adnuat, Mil.* 123. But it is a standard motif

in Ovid, most familiar to his audience as the tactic which he himself adopts as the elegiac lover; cf. *Am.* 1.4.17–18 *me specta nutusque meos vultumque loquacem;/excipe furtivas et refer ipsa notas* (instructions to his mistress), 3.11.23–4, *Her.* 16.258, 17.83–4, *Met.* 3.460, *Ars* 1.137–8, *Tr.* 2.453–4, Prop. 3.8.25–6, Tib. 1.2.21–2, 1.6.19–20. That the normally animalistic Priapus should take time to entertain this subtle form of wooing and persist with it (*sollicitat*) creates an amusing incongruity; for a similar portrayal of Priapus as the 'sophisticated' lover/love-teacher, cf. Theoc. *Id.* 1.81ff., *Ep.* 4.13ff., Tib. 1.4; similar incongruity is achieved by the uncivilised Polyphemus' cultured wooing of Galatea (Theoc. *Id.* 13, *Met.* 13.750ff.). Since the tactic is one which Ovid once endorsed as lover, a certain amount of sympathy is invited for Priapus when it fails.

419 fastus inest pulchris sequiturque superbia formam "Opposition to love is inherent to the good-looking, and pride attends beauty": a popular maxim which often comes from the lips of the experienced, long-suffering elegiac lover; cf. *Am.* 2.17.7–9 *dat facies animos . . ./scilicet a speculi sumuntur imagine fastus*, Prop. 3.8.35–6, 3.24.1–2 *falsa est ista tuae, mulier, fiducia formae,/olim oculis nimium facta superba meis*, Petr. 126.1, Juv. 10.297–8. It represents here a critical remark rather than a casual observation, as Ovid elsewhere reveals that he has no sympathy for such arrogant behaviour; cf. *Ars* 3.509–11 *nec minus in vultu damnosa superbia vestro . . . odimus immodicos (experto credite) fastus.* Ovid therefore shows some sympathy for the disdained Priapus.

fastus takes here the specialised elegiac sense 'opposition to love'; as well as the above, cf. *Ars.* 1.715, Prop. 1.1.3, Tib. 1.8.75, Pichon (1991) 143 s.v. But it is hard to resist some sort of play on the title of the poem itself.

420 inrisum: *irrideo* is found in Augustan elegy only here. It is, not surprisingly, a verb used often in comedy to express the light-hearted mockery between characters; cf. e.g. Pl. *Mos.* 179, 812, *Poen.* 1202, *Trin.* 446 *bonis tuis in rebus meas res inrides malas*, Ter. *An.* 204, *Hau.* 982, *Ph.* 956. However, the verb comes to take on more sinister connotations, with the result that it is, in Ovid, reserved for impious or cold-hearted individuals; cf. *Met.* 1.221 (the god-defying Lycaon), 5.115 (the evil killer Pedasus), 8.612 (the god-defying Pirithous), 14.714 (the heartless Anaxarete); cf. also Verg. *A.* 7.425 (Turnus). This image of Lotis might therefore be particularly negative to a contemporary audience, which again invites sympathy for Priapus.

421 nox erat: as night is traditionally a time for rest, it often

provides an effective foil for subsequent dramatic action; consequently, phrases such as *nox erat* become standard ways of anticipating drama; cf. e.g. 3.639 (Anna warned of trouble by a vision of Dido), 4.549 (Ceres), 6.673 (the sudden return to Rome of the flute-players), *Am.* 3.5.1, *Pont.* 3.3.5, Verg. *A.* 4.522 with Pease ad loc., 8.26–7. More specifically, it is Ovid's popular means of introducing the nocturnal rape attempts in this poem; cf. 2.792 *nox erat* (Tarquin on Lucretia), 2.331 *noctis erat medium* (Faunus on Omphale).

et vino somnum faciente iacebant: the collocation of wine and sleep traditionally marks the final stage of a festival; see Austin on Verg. *A.* 2.265. The tension created between a state of carefree drunken slumber and subsequent abominable crime is very powerful; as such, this motif acts as a foil for some of the most outrageous acts in myth; cf. e.g. *Her.* 14.33 (drunken husbands killed by the Danaids), Verg. *A.* 2.265–6 *invadunt urbem somno vinoque sepultam;/caeduntur vigiles* (Greeks storming Troy), 9.189, 236, 316, Prop. 4.4.83–5 (Tarpeia betraying Rome). Here the motif is used in a more 'light-hearted' context, but it does serve to maintain suspense at the start of the episode; cf. 2.332–3 *Faunus ad antra venit:/utque videt comites somno vinoque solutos* (Faunus' opportune moment for assault on Omphale).

It is worth recapping here the conditions under which the rape attempt takes place: it is a religious festival, it is dark (night) and the assailant is drunk and full of youthful vigour. It is under precisely these conditions that rape often occurs, and is often 'excused', in New Comedy; Pl. *Aul.* 792–5, Ter. *Ad.* 470–1 *persuasit nox amor vinum adulescentia:/humanumst*; K. Pierce (1997), "The Portrayal of Rape in New Comedy", in K. Pierce and S. Deacy (eds.), *Rape in Antiquity*, London, 163ff.

422 victa sopore: an essentially poetic expression; cf. e.g. 3.19, *Her.* 16.102 *lumina cum placido victa sopore iacent*, *Ars* 3.648, *Rem.* 500, Prop. 3.17.42, Tib. 1.2.2, Stat. *Silv.* 1.2.242.

423–4 Attention is now focused on Lotis. *ultima* should be taken in a spatial sense ('farthest'), since she is later acknowledged to be resting in *secreta cubilia* (427). The accumulation of detail of natural beauty in the form of grass (*in herbosa . . . humo*), tree shade (*sub acernis . . . ramis*) and, as we have been informed earlier, a stream (*rivus* (404)) categorises this area as a *locus amoenus*, a favourite Ovidian foil for subsequent violence, particularly rape; cf. 3.11ff. (Mars on Silvia); 6.327ff. (Priapus on Vesta); *Met.* 2.417ff. (Jupiter on Callisto); 4.340ff. (Salmacis on Hermaphroditus); 5.385ff. (Dis on Proserpina); 5.577ff. (Alpheus on Arethusa); Parry (1964) 275ff.; Richlin (1992) 172. Furthermore,

this setting might suggest an influence from the stage: a location of natural beauty was felt to be the ideal backdrop for the scenery of a satyr-play; cf. Vitr. 5.6.9 *satyricae vero ornantur arboribus, speluncis, montibus reliquisque agrestibus rebus in topeodis speciem deformati*, 7.5.2.

424 lusu may refer either to the standard playful disposition of nymphs (cf. e.g. *Met.* 14.556), or to the amorous sport that Lotis has been playing; for *lusus/ludere* in this erotic sense, cf. e.g. *Am.* 1.8.86, 2.3.13 *est etiam facies, sunt apti lusibus anni*, Prop. 1.10.9 with Fedeli ad loc., 2.32.29, Pichon (1991) 192 s.v.

425–32 Priapus' approach to Lotis is described very gradually. Lines 425–6 relate his initial rising and silent movement. He reaches Lotis' sleeping location (427–8), then he has reached the grass right next to her (429–30), then he is at the very moment of his desired sexual ambition (431–2). We are therefore kept in suspense as we follow the precise movements of the god, and are set up for the dramatic anti-climactic thwarting of the whole operation by the noisy ass (433–4). This type of story (a lover's nocturnal approach on a mate), with its tantalising mode of narrative, is found elsewhere; cf. 2.335–48 (Faunus), 6.337–8 (Priapus), *Met.* 10.446–64 (Myrrha), Prop. 1.3.1–30, Tib. 2.1.75–8, Van Dam on Stat. *Silv.* 2.3.14–17; cf. also *Ciris* 206–14 (Scylla's nocturnal attempt to get a lock of Nisus' hair). More specifically, the approach of a mischievous demi-god to a lover, and the final lifting up of their garment, are scenes depicted in Pompeian art; see Rizzo (1929) 113, 115, 116, 117; Grant (1975) 147, 151, 162.

The act of rape, though eventually thwarted here, is nevertheless anticipated by a series of sexual euphemisms; see nn. on *surgit* (425), *tetigit* (427), *gaudet* (431), *vota* (431), *via* and *ad... ire* (432). This tactic is also detectable in the Faunus episode with the prominent positioning of the verbs *intrat* (2.335), *venerat* (2.337) and *tetigit* (2.339). Moreover, the use of sexual euphemism can be seen more obviously in another rape scene in *Fasti*, namely that of Tarquin and Lucretia, in which Tarquin's subsequent violation is forewarned by the sword and sheath imagery; cf. 2.793–4 *surgit et aurata vagina liberat ensem/et venit in thalamos, nupta pudica, tuos.* This sort of euphemism might have been particularly common in comedy; cf. esp. Antiphanes fr. 18 Kock νύκτωρ ἀναστὰς ἔτυχεν ὧν ἐβούλετο, which contains the same connotations of *surgit* and *vota.*

425–6 The drama is introduced in a progressive tricolon, with the weak third foot caesura aptly ensuring coincidence of sense and metrical break: Priapus rises (beginning to second foot caesura), he

holds his breath (from second to fourth foot caesura), and begins his approach (from fourth foot caesura to end).

425 surgit amans: the presence of the verb, applied to a male intent on intercourse, might allude to the physical act of male arousal; cf. e.g. 2.793 *surgit* (Tarquin before raping Lucretia), Tac. *Ann.* 13.46 *saepe auditus est consurgens e convivio Caesaris seque ire ad illam* (the sexual intrigues of Otho), Adams (1982) 57. The prominent position of certain verbs near the beginning of lines—*surgit* (425), *tetigit* (427), *gaudet* (431)—marks this section out as one of action. However, one could argue that these verbs allude to the different stages of sexual intercourse: prior arousal (*surgit*), physical contact (*tetigit*), and subsequent joy (*gaudet*).

furtim: the adverb is frequently used in love elegy to describe the stealthy approach of the clandestine lover; cf. e.g. *Am.* 1.4.63–4 with McKeown ad loc., *Rem.* 33, Tib. 1.2.10 with Maltby ad loc., 1.5.65, 1.8.35.

426 suspenso digitis . . . gradu "on tip-toe", lit. "with step elevated by the toes": the ability to tip-toe is a typical requirement for the stealthy assailant; cf. 6.338 *et fert suspensos corde micante gradus* (Priapus on Vesta), Ter. *Ph.* 866–8 (the slave Geta), Tib. 2.1.77 *et pedibus praetemptat iter suspensa timore*, *Ciris* 212 *tum suspensa levans digitis vestigia primis* (Scylla on Nisus), *Thes.* 6.2.2143.24ff.

427 tetigit: *tango* is often a euphemism for the physical contact involved in sexual activity; cf. *Am.* 3.7.39–40, *Ars* 2.692, *Rem.* 415, Pl. *Aul.* 755, Ter. *Hau.* 819, *Eu.* 372–3 *tu illis fruare commodis quibu' tu illum dicebas modo: cibum una capias, adsis tangas ludas propter dormias*, *Ad.* 686, Hor. *S.* 1.2.54, Adams (1982) 185–7, Van Dam on Stat. *Silv.* 2.3.57.

niveae . . . nymphae "snowy-white nymph": like *candidus*, *niveus* is applied to the skin of both male and female as a positive, sensual attribute; cf. e.g. 2.763 (Lucretia), *Her.* 20.122 (Cydippe), *Am.* 3.3.6, *Ars* 3.309 *hos vos praecipue, niveae, decet*, *Met.* 3.423 (Narcissus), André (1949) 39f., 324ff. There is, therefore, a strong contrast in colour between Lotis (white) and her assailant Priapus (red: see 400n.); for the poetic predilection for the white/red contrast, cf. e.g. 81–2, 4.339, *Am.* 3.3.6 *niveo lucet in ore rubor*, *Met.* 4.332, André (1949) 346–7.

428 ipsa sui flatus ne sonet aura cavet "he is careful lest the very air of his own breath make a sound": the ability to hold one's breath is another requirement for successful stealthy onslaught; cf. e.g. 425, Ter. *Ph.* 868 *animam compressi* (the slave Geta), *Ciris* 211 (Scylla). Ovid may be the first to use *flatus* in the sense of human

(or, in Priapus' case, semi-human) breath; cf. *Mor.* 12 *excitat et crebris languentem flatibus ignem* (Simulus), V. Fl. 2.278, Stat. *Theb.* 4.768, *Thes.* 6.1.881.44ff. But the sheer precision here—highlighting the specific air of the breath—is an amusing periphrasis which reflects the extent to which Priapus goes to maintain absolute silence.

429 corpus librabat might merely imply that Priapus is poised for a particular course of action; cf. e.g. *Ars* 2.68 *perque novum timide corpora librat iter* (Daedalus on verge of flight). But given that Priapus is standing on the very part of the grass closest to Lotis (*finitima . . . in herba*), the phrase is probably intended to promote the idea that the god is so close to the nymph that he needs to keep his balance so as not to fall on her.

430 multi plena soporis is an unusual phrase. *plenus* is typically used to express the deepness of sleep; cf. *Met.* 7.253 *in plenos . . . somnos* (Aeson), Cels. 1.3.15, 3.7.2c. But here it is *multus* in agreement with *sopor.* This gives an unusual sense of sleep as a quantitative entity which has completely filled Lotis. The juxtaposition of *multi plena* certainly points up the complete vulnerability of the nymph; see also 422n.

431 gaudet: continuing the euphemism in this section, the verb and the associate noun *gaudium* are commonly used to allude to the orgasmic pleasure derived from sex; cf. e.g. *Rem.* 778, Cat. 61.110–12, Tib. 2.1.11–12 *vos quoque abesse procul iubeo . . . / cui tulit hesterna gaudia nocte Venus*, Adams (1982) 197–8.

a pedibus tracto velamine "when he had hitched up the garment from her feet": *velamen* does not refer here to any type of bed covering (cf. Frazer "quilt"), but rather to the particular garment worn by the nymph. This action of the would-be rapist seems to be a standard preparatory move; cf. 2.347 *interea tunicas ora subducit ab ima* (Faunus hitching up the garment of the character he believes to be Omphale); for depictions of this scene in art, see 425–32n.

431–2 vota/ad sua felici coeperat ire via "he had just begun to make for his desires by the joyous route": fittingly, the climax to Priapus' onslaught is met with the densest sexual euphemism. First, *felici . . . via* has sexual connotations, as the vagina/anus was regularly described as an entrance or passageway; cf. Cat. 15.18, *Priap.* 52.5 *porta* (anus), Auson. *Cento Nuptialis* 110–11 *tenuis quo semita ducit, / ignea rima micans*, 126 *itque reditque viam*, Adams (1982) 89. In addition, *vota* is often used in an erotic context to denote the sexual desires one has for a mate; cf. e.g. *Am.* 1.13.45–6 *ipse deum genitor . . . / commisit*

noctes in sua vota duas with McKeown ad loc., 2.4.36, 3.2.81, *Met.* 11.227, Prop. 1.10.4, 1.17.4, Pichon (1991) 300–1 s.v. Finally, in some circumstances, *ad(eo)* can denote sexual approach; cf. Pl. *Truc.* 149–50 *si arationes/habituris, qui arari solent, ad pueros ire meliust,* Tac. *Ann.* 13.46. As in the doublet story in Book 6, intense drama is created by Priapus' being thwarted at the very moment (*coeperat*) before success; cf. 6.341 *ibat ut inciperet.*

433–4 The contribution of the ass is the same in the doublet story in Book 6, but Ovid makes the scene here more dramatic and mock-pompous; see individual nn. In each case, it is the sudden braying of the ass which startles the sleeping victim (435 *territa,* 6.343 *territa*), providing a novel manifestation of the traditional belief that an ass' braying was a source of fear; cf. e.g. Hyg. *Astr.* 2.23 (the asses of the Sileni frighten away an entire enemy force), Plin. *Nat.* 10.204 (asses cause panic to birds).

The very presence of the ass in the story is intriguing. This animal was often used as a metaphor for the bestial sexual lust of humans; cf. e.g. *Priap.* 52.9 *ad partem veniet salax asellus* (euphemism for human penis during intercourse), Juv. 9.92 with Courtney ad loc., Petr. 24; S. Mills (1978), "Ovid's donkey act", *CJ* 73, 304–5. As such, it is ironic that in both stories involving Priapus it is the ass which is specifically responsible for *thwarting* such erotic behaviour. It is worth noting, however, that in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* (9.27) Lucius, in the form of an ass, thwarts an adulterous affair between youth and baker's wife by giving away the young man's hiding place to the baker. It is plausible that both Ovid and Apuleius are drawing on a common comic tradition for their use of the ass, perhaps the adultery-mime; for this type of mime, see P. Kehoe (1984), "The Adultery Mime Reconsidered", in D. Bright and E. Ramage (eds.), *Classical Texts and Their Traditions: Studies in Honor of C.R. Trahman,* California, 89–106.

433 *ecce* introduces a dramatic change of focus. We have to wait until the end of the line to discover the subject *asellus,* but hints are given by the preceding descriptive details: it brays (*rudens*), it is hoarse (*rauco*), and it carries Silenus (*Sileni vector*). Ovid's deliberate teasing of the reader here adds to the drama; for similar use of this strategy in Ovid, see 95n.

rudens: *rudo* is most commonly used of the braying of an ass, and Ovid himself uses it exclusively in this manner; cf. e.g. 6.342

intempestivo cum rudit ille sono, Ars 3.290, Var. *Gramm.* fr. 127 Goetz, Pers. 3.9, Apul. *Met.* 7.13.

Sileni vector: *vector* is more commonly used in a passive sense to describe someone carried, a rider or passenger; for the passenger of a ship, cf. *Her.* 18.148, Verg. *Ecl.* 4.38; for the horse rider, cf. *Ars* 3.555, Prop. 4.7.84. Here Ovid adopts the active sense 'carrier, bearer' and, according to *OLD* and Lewis/Short, there is only one (doubtful) previous usage; cf. Lucil. 476 Marx *ipse ecus, non formonsus, gradarius, optimus vector* (codd. *victor*). After Ovid, it is found frequently in high poetry as part of a grand epithet; cf. Sen. *Her. O.* 553 (bull carrier of Europa), 1907 *stelligeri vector Olympi* (Atlas), Luc. 6.392 (Nessus), Stat. *Theb.* 9.858 (Jupiter), V. Fl. 1.425 (carrier of Helle). Its presence here to describe the ass has a mock-pompous feel, which befits its role as 'hero' of this episode; for further mock-pompous touches to the ass, see 434n. In the story in Book 6, the ass is described in more mundane language; cf. 6.339 *forte senex, quo vectus erat, Silenus asellum.*

434 intempestivos edidit ore sonos: *intempestivus* is avoided by other late Republican/Augustan poets (except Lucretius) owing to its awkward prosody; cf. 6.342 *intempestivo . . . sono* (the ass in the story of Priapus and Vesta), *Am.* 3.7.67, *Met.* 4.33, 10.689, *Tr.* 4.5.16, 5.6.45. Ovid's use of it here is particularly effective, as it produces a heavily spondaic tempo which adds to the mock-solemnity of the 'hero's' rescue of Lotis. The collocation *edidit ore* can be used to express the sounds of animals (cf. 444 (birds), *Her.* 14.91, *Met.* 1.637 (cow)), but it is more often used to introduce solemn utterances; cf. 100 (Janus), *Her.* 11.96, *Am.* 3.6.72 (priestess), *Met.* 8.703 (Jupiter), 12.577, Verg. *A.* 5.693, 7.194 (Latinus), Tib. 1.4.73 (mock-pompous Priapus), Navarro-Antolín on Lygd. 4.42. Its usage here, therefore, increases the mock-pomposity surrounding the ass' salvation of Lotis. For the motif of (in)appropriate time for utterance, see 445n.

435–8 The finale of the story centres on two images—the fleeing of an individual (Lotis (435–6)) and phallic exhibition (Priapus' naked posture (437–8))—both of which appear to be standard traits of contemporary mime; see 436n., 437n. The end to this episode is markedly different from that of the doublet story in Book 6. Though both females start up alarmed by the ass—*territa consurgit nymphe* (435), *territa voce gravi surgit dea* (6.343)—in our story it is Lotis who flees, amidst the guests' amusement, whereas in Book 6 it is Priapus who feels

the need to escape, through a crowd which is depicted as anything but sympathetic to his conduct; cf. 6.344 *per infestas effugit ille manus*. This difference can again be accounted for in terms of the significance of the two victims involved: Lotis is portrayed as promiscuous, but a rape attempt on Vesta, the virginal goddess of chastity, is a source of outrage and condemnation; see 391–440 (ii) n.

436 fugiens: it is the victim that flees the scene here, the perpetrator Priapus in the doublet story in Book 6. Cicero informs us that the flight of an individual was a typically clichéd way of ending a mime; cf. Cic. *Cael.* 65 *mimi ergo iam exitus . . . in quo cum clausula non invenitur, fugit aliquis e manibus, dein scabilla concrepant, aulaeum tollitur.*

437–8 The story concludes with the amusing image of the indecent god caught unawares. It is a recurrent motif in *Fasti* to end a comic episode with unanimous laughter at individuals' embarrassment, and it is one which stems back to Homer; cf. Hom. *Od.* 8.343ff. (Mars and Venus exposed as lovers), Ov. *Fast.* 2.355–6 (Faunus' misfortunes), 3.693–6 (Mars duped by Anna), 3.757–60 (Silenus' injuries in attempting to steal honey), *Ars* 2.585, *Met.* 4.188–9.

437 obscena nimium quoque parte paratus "aroused with that part of his body which is all too obscene": *parte* is sometimes erroneously taken to mean 'role'; cf. e.g. Schilling "trop bien préparé pour sa besogne lubrique". In fact, *obscena pars* refers to Priapus' exposed phallus, as the phrase is elsewhere employed as a discreet reference to genitalia; cf. *Ars* 2.583–4 *non vultus texisse suos, non denique possunt/partibus obscenis opposuisse manus* (the intrigue of Mars and Venus exposed), *Rem.* 429, *Priap.* 9.1 *cur obscena mihi pars sit sine veste, requiris?*, August. *C.D.* 14.16. *nimium quoque* ('all too')—a colloquial phrase apparently confined to Ovid [cf. *Her.* 6.53, *Ars* 1.587, *Pont.* 3.9.49, *Tr.* 4.10.99]—should be taken directly with *obscena . . . parte* (the words encompassing the phrase) to highlight the particular embarrassment of Priapus' large naked parts.

The scene ends, therefore, with the focus of amusement on Priapus' phallus. Phallic exhibition is an evident feature of the scenes of rape failure in *Fasti*; cf. 2.345–6 *ascendit spondaque sibi propiore recumbit,/et tumidum cornu durius inguen erat* (Faunus prepares for Omphale). This may suggest an influence from contemporary mime, of which phallic exhibition was a visible part; cf. Arnob. *Adv. Nat.* 7.33 *mimis nimirum dii gaudent . . . delectantur, ut res est, stupidorum capitibus rasis . . . factis et dictis turpibus, fascinorum ingentium rubore,* Fantham (1983) 200, Barchiesi (1997) 238ff.

paratus: for *paratus* in the euphemistic sense, 'aroused, 'up for

it", cf. *Priap.* 46.7–8 *nam quamvis videar satis paratus,/erucarum opus est decem maniplis* (Priapus speaking).

438 ad lunae lumina "beneath the moonlight": *luna* and *lumen* are elsewhere placed together in close proximity—cf. e.g. *Her.* 18.59 *luna fere tremulum praebebat lumen, Ib.* 32, Cat. 34.16, Verg. *A.* 3.645, 4.80–1, Prop. 1.3.32—which reflects the popular etymological link between the two; cf. Isid. *Orig.* 3.71.2 *luna . . . nomen per derivationem a solis luce, eo quod ab eo lumen accipiat,* Maltby 351 s.v.

risus "object of laughter": this sense of *risus* is fairly rare; cf. Hor. *S.* 2.2.107, Prop. 3.25.1 *risus eram positis inter convivia mensis* with Fedeli ad loc., Claud. *Eutr.* 2.535.

439–40 Ovid summarises, in solemn manner, the result that the perpetrating ass is sacrificed to Priapus. By this change in tone, the poet serves notice that he is returning to the serious (condemnatory) tone that he discarded at 392; for the implications of the length of the story on Ovid's stance, see 349–456 (ii) n.

439 morte dedit poenas "he paid the penalty with his life": for the rare usage of the idiom to refer to animal atonement, see 353n.

440 Hellespontiaco . . . deo: the cult of Priapus originated in Lampsacus, which is situated on the Hellespont; cf. 6.345 *Lampsacos hoc animal solita est mactare Priapo, Tr.* 1.10.24–6, Cat. fr. 1, *Priap.* 55.5–6, 75, Herter (1932) 38–40. Consequently, Priapus is referred to as the 'Hellespontic god'; cf. Verg. *G.* 4.111 *Hellespontiaci servet tutela Priapi,* Petr. 139.2 *Hellespontiaci . . . Priapi.*

441–56 Ovid explains how birds finally became sacrificial victims. Lines 441–4 form the initial address to birds, pointing out their beneficial or endearing aspects, before lines 445–8 reveal the characteristic which proves to be their downfall, namely their ability to communicate. After a summing-up sentiment in 449–50, Ovid concludes by giving three examples of bird sacrifice: the dove (451–2), the goose (453–4) and the cock (455–6).

So far in his discourse, Ovid has made only subtle criticism of live sacrifice; see 349–456n., 349–52n. In this instance, however, Ovid establishes his own sympathetic stance towards birds at the outset (441–4), before strategically unpacking the logic on which bird sacrifice is based. At face value in this section, the institution of bird sacrifice appears to be very logically motivated. As soon as we learn that the birds are no longer exempt from sacrifice, we are given the gods' reasoning for this so as to justify their decision (introduced by *quia* (445)). The poet continues by appearing to endorse the gods'

reasoning (*nec tamen hoc falsum* (447)). We are then given three examples of bird sacrifice which, given the connective *ergo* (451), we are invited to read as a logical consequence of this divine reasoning. However, the logical manner of the telling only acts as a foil for the illogical nature of the train of thought. The reason given for the gods' condemnation of birds—that they reveal to man divine thoughts in the form of augury—is astonishing, given the established tradition that says that it is the gods themselves who have sanctioned this purpose in birds; see 445–8n. The three examples of bird sacrifice which follow in 451–6 only serve to further undermine the argument, as these birds put their voice to good use; see 451–6nn.

The case presented for bird sacrifice in 441–56, therefore, hinges on an astonishing premise in 445–6. There are two possible ways in which we can interpret this. Ovid may be 'correcting' the established tradition and suggesting that the gods have genuinely not sanctioned the birds to reveal divine thoughts. More likely, however, given the criticism of the gods' active role in sacrifice in this section, we should take the established tradition as the 'truth' and see the gods as acting hypocritically in punishing birds for something which they originally sanctioned. However we interpret 441–56, it is clear that a wedge has been driven between the members of the hallowed augural trinity: the birds may indeed give true divine signs; some mortals may be able to interpret these signs correctly; but the gods are not pleased with these revelations. This novel and playful approach to augury, established at the beginning of the poem, can only offer more complex readings of augural motifs elsewhere in the poem, especially the augural connotations of the name 'Augustus' (609–12) and Romulus' foundation of the city by augury (4.811–18).

441–4 Ovid starts with a sympathetic and sustained address to the birds (*fueratis* . . . *facitis* . . . *fovetis* . . . *editis*) which serves as an introduction to the endearing attributes of the species.

441 intactae fueratis aves: the time to which Ovid refers here is the Golden Age, an era in which birds enjoyed complete safety; cf. *Met.* 15.99 *tunc et aves tutae movere per aera pennas* (Pythagoras on the Golden Age), [Sen.] *Oct.* 406–12 (bird-catching is a feature of a post-Golden Age).

solacia ruris "comforts to the countryside": Ovid probably alludes here to the bird's song, which is renowned for its soothing quality; cf. 155 *et tepidum volucres concentibus aera mulcent*, 3.17–18, Hor. *Carm.* 3.1.20–1, Verg. *A.* 7.32–4, Sauvage (1975) 126.

442 innocuumque: the adjective may have religious overtones here ('chaste, undefiled') which would reinforce the birds' innocence; for *innocuus* in this sense, cf. e.g. 2.623 *innocui veniant* (guests at the Caristia) with Bömer ad loc., Stat. *Silv.* 3.3.13, Appel (1909) 187.

443 plumis ova fovetis: parental love for their young is a well-recognised feature of birds; cf. e.g. *Met.* 8.213–14, Aesch. *Th.* 290–4, Eur. *Tr.* 146–8, *Heracl.* 70–2, Verg. *A.* 5.213ff., Hor. *Epod.* 1.19–22, Prop. 4.5.10, Sauvage (1975) 131ff. However, the earliest indication of this love, in the form of the nurturing of the eggs, is a much rarer image; cf. 4.696 *nunc matris plumis ova fovenda dabat* (hen), Claud. *III Cons. Hon. Praef.* 3–4 *excuso saluit cum germine proles/ovaque maternus rupit hiulca tepor.*

444 et facili dulces editis ore modos: concise phraseology which praises the ease/versatility (*facili*), sweetness (*dulces*) and rhythmic nature (*modos*) of bird song. All of these were recognised features of the bird's special craft; cf. e.g. *Am.* 1.13.8, 3.1.4, Lucr. 5.1379ff. (human singing originated from imitation of the rhythmic strains of birds), Prop. 1.2.14, Tib. 1.3.60 *dulce sonant tenui gutture carmen aves*, Sauvage (1975) 123ff. Ovid's focus on the aesthetic charm of the sound marks a strong contrast to the following lines (445–6), where it is precisely the bird's voice which offends the gods. For the grand collocation *edo ore*, see 434n.

445–8 Ovid explains the specific reason why the birds are sacrificed: they betray the thoughts of the gods to mankind (446) owing to the fact that they dwell in close proximity to deities (*dis . . . proxima* (447)) and have the ability to communicate (*linguae* (445)).

There are indeed myths in which a bird's talkative nature results in punishment from the gods. Ovid himself relates the downfall of the raven and the crow in just these terms; cf. 2.243–66 (raven lying to Phoebus), *Met.* 2.531–632, esp. 540 *lingua fuit damno*, 564–5 *mea poena volucres/admonuisse potest, ne voce pericula quaerant.* To extend this type of justification, however, to the sphere of augury is an astonishing move. It was the established view that, far from working against the gods, prophetic birds were in fact carrying out heavenly duty by providing a medium through which divine counsel could be conveyed to mortals; cf. e.g. Xen. *Mem.* 1.1.3, Cic. *N.D.* 2.160 *avis quasdam, et alites et oscines . . . rerum augurandarum causa esse natas putamus*, *Div.* 1.120 with Pease ad loc., Plu. *Mor.* 975a–b, Amm. 21.1.9, Linderski (1986) 2226ff. Even the Stoics, who reject the idea that gods perform such menial tasks as directing every movement of birds,

agree that there is a certain divine, supernatural force controlling these birds; cf. Cic. *Div.* 1.12 with Pease ad loc., 1.118, Sen. *Nat.* 2.32.4 *ista nihilominus divina ope geruntur si non a deo pennae avium reguntur.*

On reading these lines, we are left with two alternatives: either Ovid is 'correcting' an established tradition, or else the gods are acting in a hypocritical manner; see 441–56n.

445 nihil ista iuvant "those things help you not one bit": a forceful and bitter statement: *nihil iuvant* is much stronger than *non iuvant*, and *ista* is ruefully dismissive. For *nihil* as internal accusative with *iuvo*, cf. *Am.* 1.4.68, 2.1.19 *Iuppiter, ignoscas: nil me tua tela iuvabant*, *Pont.* 1.5.78, Liv. 10.14.13.

linguae crimen habetis "you are open to accusation on the grounds of your tongue": *crimen habere* is an idiom found predominantly in poetry; cf. *Am.* 2.5.6, *Ars* 1.586 *tuta frequensque licet sit via, crimen habet*, 2.272, *Rem.* 328, Prop. 2.32.2, Tib. 1.6.41, *Thes.* 4.1192.23ff. This section makes a thematic link to the last episode involving the ass, whose crime was likewise expressed in terms of unsanctioned utterance; cf. 434 *intempestivos . . . sonos*, 439 *auctor clamoris*. In fact, the whole issue of the appropriate time for speech and silence is a constant concern in the poem—cf. also 25, 560 (untimely utterance of cattle causes Cacus' downfall)—and may represent an effort to address the concerns of Augustus, whose tolerance of freedom of speech was markedly reduced in his latter years; see Feeney (1992) 7ff., Newlands (1995) 146–208 *passim*.

446 dique putant mentes vos aperire suas "namely that the gods think that you reveal their thoughts": the connective *-que* here acts as an explicative link between this phrase and the preceding, in that it expands on the nature of the *crimen linguae*; for similar examples of an explicative *-que* and *et*, cf. e.g. 306, 460, 648, Var. *R.* 2.2.2 *incipiam primus . . . et dicam de primigenia pecuaria*, *Thes.* 5.2.895.59ff., H.-Sz. 484. In the light of the established view that the gods sanction augural birds, *putant* is a strikingly weak verb; see 445–8n.

447 nec tamen hoc falsum "nor indeed is this untrue": at face value, Ovid seems to be endorsing the reasoning of the gods. But this is not the case. All Ovid does in 447–8 is to lend support to the widely-held view that birds reveal the will of the gods (and in differing ways). The poet's endorsement of such a well-established belief is therefore quite unremarkable, and does nothing to remove the surprise that the birds are *punished* for this.

448 nunc pinna veras, nunc datis ore notas: Roman augury consisted of two types of prophetic birds. The *alites* gave presage by their flight, and they were further categorised as *praepetes* if they gave favourable omen, *inebrae* if unfavourable. The other type, the *oscines*, gave presage by their utterance; cf. Cic. *Div.* 1.120 *eademque efficit in avibus divina mens, ut tum huc tum illuc volent alites, tum in hac tum in illa parte se occultent, tum a dextra tum a sinistra parte canant oscines* with Pease ad loc., Plin. *Nat.* 10.6–28, 29ff. (list of *alites* and *oscines* respectively), Fest. 214 L., Serv. *A.* 1.393, 3.246, 361, 6.15. Ovid's usage of *os* here alludes to the popular etymology of the *oscines*; cf. Var. *L.* 6.76 *hinc oscines dicuntur apud augures, quae ore faciunt auspicium*, Serv. *A.* 3.361.

449 tuta diu . . . tum denique caesa est: by implying that sacrifice of birds is a much more recent type of animal sacrifice than the others, Ovid gives the impression of having charted the entire history of animal sacrifice from the first (*prima* (349)) to the last.

volucrum proles: *proles* most often refers to humans, and its usage to denote the members of a particular species of animal is rare and essentially poetic; cf. Lucr. 2.661 *equorum duellica proles*, Verg. *G.* 3.541 *maris immensi prolem.* The phrase has an elevated feel ('progeny of the winged') which is in line with the poet's respect for the birds.

450 indicis: Ovid may be the first to apply *index* to a non-human informant; cf. 2.81 (Dolphin), *Met.* 2.546 (crow), *Aetna* 246 (Serius), *Thes.* 7.1.1140.71ff.; cf. also *Am.* 3.13.21.

451–6 The opening connective *ergo* (451) invites us to read the following examples of bird sacrifice as causally linked to the notion that birds should be punished for revealing divine thoughts (445–6). Certainly, the birds mentioned here—the dove (451–2), the goose (453–4) and the cock (455–6)—all qualify as birds who in some way use their *lingua* to provide information for man, though it is unclear whether they are all augural birds in the strict sense (see nn.). Nevertheless, in each case, the suggestion that these birds deserve punishment seems most illogical, given their harmless nature or meritorious deeds (see nn.). Elsewhere in fact, Ovid highlights two of these birds, the white dove and the goose, as deserving of the highest praise; cf. *Met.* 2.537–9 *ut aequaret totas sine labe columbas/nec servaturis vigili Capitolia voce/cederet anseribus* (before its crime, the raven used to be on a par with these great birds). The connective *ergo* (451) is therefore inappropriate, and the case for bird sacrifice further undermined; see 441–56n.

451–2 The dove is an augural bird which is supposed to have

given prophetic utterance in the oak grove of Dodona; cf. Plin. *Nat.* 10.104 (listed among the *oscines*), Sil. 3.680 *implet fatidico Dodonida murmure quercum*, Serv. *A.* 3.466, Martin (1914) 57f. It is traditionally regarded as a bird sacred to Venus; cf. e.g. *Am.* 1.2.23, *Met.* 15.386, Verg. *A.* 6.190, Prop. 3.3.31, Mart. 13.66. Consequently, it is to this deity in the Roman world that the dove is sacrificed; cf. Prop. 4.5.65–6 *cape torquatae, Venus o regina, columbae/ob meritum ante tuos guttura secta focos*, Juv. 6.548–50 (dove sacrificed to predict love), Frazer on 451.

451 suo coniunx abducta marito: *coniunx* can denote either member of an animal partnership; see 334n. *maritus* is used elsewhere of the male partner, where it usually refers to the leader of a herd; cf. *Am.* 3.5.15 *taurus erat comes huic, feliciter ille maritus*, Verg. *G.* 3.125, Hor. *Carm.* 1.17.7 with Nisbet/Hubbard ad loc., *Thes.* 8.404.84ff. The combination of the two terms aptly stresses a sense of conjugal fidelity between the doves, which is a famous attribute of their kind; cf. *Am.* 2.6.56 *oscula dat cupido blanda columba mari*, Cat. 68.125ff., Prop. 2.15.27–8, Plin. *Nat.* 10.104 *coniugi fidem non violant communemque servant domum*, Mart. 11.104.9, 12.65.8, Sauvage (1975) 252ff. Therefore, the forced break-up of this traditional union comes as a shock. The use of the verb *abduco* ('lead away') may intensify the situation: it may be intended as the antithesis of *deduco*, the verb regularly used to denote the coming together into matrimony (see Navarro-Antolín on Lygd. 4.31). The absurdity of the sacrifice could not be more forcefully put: though Venus' traditional role is to bring lovers together, the sacrifice to her is described in terms of the splitting up of a loving 'married' couple.

452 in calidis . . . focis: *in calidis* (**AU**ω) is the majority reading, and creates a fitting image of an altar hot from the burning of offerings; cf. 3.284 *vinaque dat tepidis farraque salsa focis*, also 3.727–8 *ante tuos ortus arae sine honore fuerunt,/Liber, et in gelidis herba reperta focis* (an altar not in use). The majority of editions accept one of the two Heinsian conjectures *Idaliis* or *in Cnidiis*, both cult epithets for Venus, on the grounds that this identifies a divine recipient for the offering, in line with the next two sacrifices (*Inachioti/Inachi lauta* (454), *Nocti* (455)). However, given the well-known association of the dove with Venus (see 451–2n.), there is no reason to emend the majority reading in this manner; see Le Bonniec (1960) 197.

453–4 "Nor did the defence of the Capitol help the goose and prevent it from offering its liver on your chargers, o sumptuous daughter of Inachus": Ovid starts his section on the goose by recall-

ing their most famous service. When the Gauls were making an attempt to seize the Capitol in 390 B.C., unnoticed by both guards and dogs, it was the sacred geese of Juno who raised the alarm by their cackling and flapping of wings; cf. e.g. Liv. 5.47.1–5, Dion. Hal. 13.7–8, Plin. *Nat.* 10.51. For this reason, the goose is often held in high esteem (*Met.* 2.538–9, Lucr. 4.683), and its vital contribution to the history of Rome is enshrined on the shield of Aeneas (Verg. *A.* 8.652–62). Ovid recalls this service so as to create a tension with the next sentiment: though the goose has a valuable asset when alive, it is nevertheless sacrificed to the Egyptian deity, Isis; cf. Paus. 10.32.14–16 (the goose is sacrificed to Isis by the poor man), Juv. 6.540–1 (goose sacrificed to Isis' husband Osiris), Frazer on 453.

Ovid's condemnation of Isis is, in one sense, consistent with his former guise as elegiac lover: the elegiac lover typically dislikes Isis for the sexual abstinence she prescribes for her followers, the elegiac mistresses; cf. *Am.* 1.8.74, Prop. 2.33a, Tib. 1.3.23–6, Harmon (1986) 1928ff. But there is a more pressing political dimension to the sentiment. As part of the second Triumvirate, Octavian had agreed to a temple being built to Isis on the Campus Martius in 43 B.C. However, his views about the Egyptian deity ultimately changed during the conflict with Antony, as Cleopatra was claiming to be the 'new Isis'; following Actium, Augustus made attempts to ban all Egyptian shrines from the *pomerium* and restrict their cult practice; cf. Dio 53.2.4, Witt (1971) 222–3, BNP I.230–1. It is possible, then, to read 453–4 as consistent with Augustan ideology: the Romans' 'proper' treatment of the goose is contrasted with its 'barbaric' treatment at the hands of the Egyptian deity (especially if *lauta* is taken pejoratively (see n.)).

However, the issue may be more problematic. It is clear from the repeated attempts to ban Isis-worship at Rome (BNP I.230–1) that it was still practised; if we are, therefore, encouraged to think of *Romans* sacrificing the goose to Isis, then attention is drawn to the hypocrisy of the Romans' treatment of the animal which saved their city. Another detail in these lines might further encourage us to think in terms of Roman hypocrisy. There is no evidence to support Ovid's claim in 454 that it was specifically the liver (*iecur*) that was offered to Isis. Goose liver, however, was a recognised culinary delicacy among the Romans; cf. Hor. *S.* 2.8.85–8 *deinde secuti/mazonomo pueri magno . . . et ficis pastum iecur anseris albae* (Roman feast), Plin. *Nat.* 10.52, Mart. 13.58, Juv. 5.114, André (1981) 129–30. It is, at the very

least, unfortunate that Ovid should allude to the extravagant (irreligious) use to which Romans put the 'saviours' of their city.

453 nec . . . iuvant . . . quo minus: the presence of *quo minus* extends the meaning of *nec . . . iuvant* such that it implies a sense of 'not preventing' as well as 'not helping'; cf. Cic. *Fin.* 4.64 *nihil igitur adiuvat procedere et progredi in virtute, quo minus miserrimus sit,* V. Max. 9.14.3, K.-St. II.2.260.

454 Inachi lauta "o sumptuous daughter of Inachus": a reference to the Egyptian goddess Isis, who is regularly identified with Inachus' daughter, Io; cf. e.g. 5.619–20, *Met.* 1.747 *nunc dea linigera colitur celeberrima turba,* Hdt. 2.41, Apollod. 2.1.3, Hyg. *Fab.* 145, Prop. 2.28a.17–18, 2.33a.3–4.

The MSS offer a variety of (unsatisfactory) readings here: *inache laute* (**Aω**), *inachi bacha* (**U**), *inachi vacca* (**Mς**). The most compelling reading, which also requires least emendation, is probably *Inachi lauta.* Though *lautus* is predominantly prosaic—it is only elsewhere found in poetry at Verg. *A.* 8.361—it is commonly used of 'sumptuous' banquets/banqueters; cf. Cic *Fam.* 7.26.2 *nam dum volunt isti lauti terra nata, quae lege [sumptuaria] excepta sunt,* Nep. *Att.* 13.6, *Thes.* 7.2.1054.19ff. The epithet might therefore have a pejorative sense here, conveying the wanton luxury typically associated with the East: Isis is like a lavish banqueter receiving her meal. The Alton conjecture *Inachioti* (vocative of *Inachiotis,* 'daughter of Inachus') is also possible, but would be a hapax legomenon; for the case, see Alton (1922) 286.

455–6 Ovid turns finally to the fate of the cock, which is elsewhere referred to as the 'crested bird'; cf. *Met.* 11.597, Mart. 9.68.3, 14.223.2 *cristataeque sonant undique lucis aves.* One of its chief roles is to announce the coming of dawn to mankind; cf. 2.767 *iam dederat cantus lucis praenuntius ales,* Lucr. 4.710ff., Plin. *Nat.* 10.46, Prud. *Cath.* 1.1 *ales diei nuntius.* There is evidence to suggest that it was sacrificed to a variety of deities, but no other source mentions Night; for sacrifices to other deities, cf. e.g. Plat. *Phaedo* 118a, Fest. 98 L. s.v. '*in insula*' (to Aesculapius), Plu. *Pyrrh.* 3.4, *Ages.* 33.4 (after a military victory), *Mor.* 696e (to Heracles), Headlam on Herodas 4.16. However, it is quite possible that such a sacrifice was conducted to Night: the cock's ability to summon the day associates it with human time-keeping (cf. Plin. *Nat.* 10.46), and it is elsewhere referred to as sacred to another temporal deity, Month (Diog. Laert. 8.34). Alternatively, the sacrifice might be an innovation on the part of the poet, an extension of the idea that the cock is incompatible with Sleep; cf. *Met.* 11.597–8 *non*

vigil ales ibi cristati cantibus oris/evocat Auroram (the cave of Sleep is devoid of such an annoyance).

Nox is a chthonic deity, associated with Chaos and Discord, who is particularly worshipped by magicians and witches; cf. *Met.* 7.192 (Medea), Hor. *Epod.* 5.49ff. (Canidia), Verg. *A.* 6.249–50 (Aeneas in Underworld), Tupet (1976) 13–14, 17. Given the official condemnation of magical cults (BNP I.231–6) and the love elegists' general distaste for magic (in the form of the procuress: cf. esp. *Am.* 1.8 and Prop. 4.5), there is every reason to suggest that this sacrifice is designed to disgust.

457–8 9th January Rising of the Dolphin

457–8 Ovid embarks on his third astronomical observation of the poem, namely the rising of the Dolphin. It is the first of several appearances for this constellation in the poem: we later learn how the dolphin is transferred to the sky (2.81–118), and we are invited to follow its progress as it disappears on 3rd February (2.79–80) and reappears again in the evening of 10th June (6.471–2, 720).

The constellation is more commonly referred to as *Delphinus*; cf Var. *R.* 2.5.13, Cic. *Arat.* 333, Plin. *Nat.* 18.234. The rare alternative *Delphin* is found elsewhere in Latin only in Germanicus' translation (*Arat.* 321), and is itself derived from Δελφίν (Erat. *Catast.* 31). The constellation may certainly be considered a *clarum sidus* (457) as it consists of five stars in quadrilateral shape, of which the third is the brightest; see Kidd on Arat. 316–18.

Ovid's suggestion that it rises on the same day as the Agonalia (9th January) is only one of a range of dates entertained by ancient authors; cf. Col. 11.2.94 (27th December), Plin. *Nat.* 18.234 (4th January); see also Ideler (1825) 148, who suggests that the true rising occurred on 31st December. The charting of the constellation at this point may, however, serve a particular poetic function of inviting comparison between the stellar and human worlds. In light of the preceding discourse on animals (349–456), we may be tempted at first to see the dolphin as yet another animal evoked by Ovid in his long catalogue—the opening *interea* might encourage a thematic as well as a temporal link. If we are tempted, a sharp contrast is witnessed between the ways in which animals are treated in the human and astral spheres: whereas humans sacrifice even the most

undeserving animals, the dolphin not only enjoys eternal life but also gets to follow its former earthly pursuit of playing in the waves (458).

458 patriis: for *patrius* in the specific sense 'native', referring to something which has been familiar to generations of a particular species of animal, cf. Man. 5.394–5 *at, cum se patrio producens aequore Piscis/in caelumque ferens alienis finibus ibit,* Col. 6.1.1, 9.12.1, *Thes.* 10.1.762.67ff.

exserit ora vadis: it was conventional to express the setting of constellations in terms of the animal/entity it represented plunging into the sea (see 314n.). The reversal of this image is, however, rare—cf. Hes. *Op.* 565–7 (Arcturus)—but fits this particular marine animal very well; cf. Man. 5.416–17 *caeruleus ponto cum se Delphinus in astra/erigit.*

459–60 10th January Midwinter

459–60 "The next dawn marks winter with a dividing-line down the middle, such that what remains will be equal to what has passed": Ovid assigns midwinter to 10th January; cf. Columella (11.2.97) who assigns it to 4th January. This is the first of several comments on features of seasonal interest in the poem; cf. 2.149–50 (beginning of spring), 3.877–8 (length of day and night equal), 4.901–2 (mid-point of spring), 5.601–2 (beginning of summer), 6.789–90 (summer solstice). Such seasonal comment is only found in one of the official *fasti*, the *Fasti Venusini*, which notes the summer solstice on 26th June: *Solstitium confec(tum)* (Degrassi 59).

461–586 11th January Carmentalia I

461–586 This section falls into several distinct parts. Lines 461–4 introduce us to the Carmentalia, before Ovid invokes Carmentis specifically to help him discover the reason behind her festival (465–8). Two stretches of narrative follow. The first tells of the journey of Carmentis and Evander to Italy and the foundation of Pallanteum (469–542). The second tells of an incident which occurs in the region a short time after this foundation, namely the slaying of Cacus by Hercules, which results in the foundation of the Ara Maxima (543–82). After a prediction of Hercules' deification (583–4), the section ends with a final prayer to Carmentis by the poet (585–6).

461 proxima . . . Tithono nupta relicto "When next the bride of Tithonus has left her husband": *nupta* (UMς) here refers to Aurora, goddess of the Dawn, who carried off Tithonus to be her husband; cf. Hom. *h. Venus* 218ff., Prop. 2.18b.7–8 *at non Tithoni spernens Aurora senectam/desertum Eoa passa iacere domo est.* Describing the coming of dawn in terms of this marital relationship, especially in terms of Aurora's early rising from her husband's bed, is a well-established poetic motif; cf. e.g. 3.403–4, 4.943 *cum Phrygis Assaraci Tithonia fratre relicto*, 6.473 *iam, Phryx, a nupta quereris, Tithone, relinqui*, 729 *iam tua, Laomedon, oritur nurus*, *Her.* 18.111–12, *Am.* 2.5.35, Hom. *Il.* 11.1ff., *Od.* 5.1ff., Verg. *G.* 1.446–7, *A.* 4.584–5 with Pease ad loc., 9.459–50.

However, the reference here to the day as 'the next bride' is a more complex extension of the personification and defies a literal translation. Nevertheless, the majority reading *nupta* should be retained—in favour of the gloss *aurora* (ω)—on the grounds that Ovid extends such personification elsewhere in the poem; cf. 4.713–14 *<u>proxima</u> cum veniet terras visura patentes/<u>Memnonis</u> in roseis lutea <u>mater</u> equis* ('the next mother of Memnon' = 'the next day'), 5.159–60 *<u>postera</u> cum roseam pulsis <u>Hyperionis</u> astris/in matutinis lampada tollet equis* ('the next daughter of Hyperion' = 'the next day'), 6.567 *Pallantide . . . eadem* ('on the same Pallantis' = 'on the same day'), Le Bonniec (1960) 198.

462 Arcadiae sacrum . . . deae: the 'Arcadian goddess' is Carmentis (Carmenta in some sources) who is popularly recognised as the mother of Evander; cf. Verg. *A.* 8.335–6 *matrisque . . ./Carmentis nymphae* (Evander speaking), Liv. 1.7.8 *Evander . . . venerabilior divinitate credita Carmentae matris* with Ogilvie ad loc., Hyg. *Fab.* 277.

The rite held in her honour is the Carmentalia; cf. Var. *L.* 6.12 *Carmentalia nominantur quod sacra tum et feriae Carmentis*, Dion. Hal. 1.32.2. It is celebrated on two non-consecutive days, 11th and 15th January, and is marked in the official *fasti* by the initials CAR (*<u>Fasti Antiates Maiores</u>*, *<u>Caeretani</u>*, *<u>Maffeiani</u>*, *<u>Oppiani</u>*), KARM (*<u>Fasti Praenestini</u>*) or CARM (*<u>Fasti Verulani</u>*). Carmentis is honoured in two specific capacities among the ancients, and Ovid devotes a section on each of these. In his second entry, under 15th January (617–36), Ovid calls upon the goddess in her capacity as helper of women in childbirth; see 617–36nn. Here in 461–586, he calls upon her exclusively in her role as singer of prophecies. Having first established a derivation of her name from *carmen* (see 467n.), a substantial proportion of the ensuing narrative is made up of her prophetic utterances; cf. 475–6 (reported warning), 479–96 (encouragement to Evander and promise of success), 509–36 (prophecy of Rome's future), 583–4 (prophecy of Hercules).

pontificale: the *pontifices* were the individuals primarily responsible for carrying out religious duties from the time of early Rome; see BNP I.24–8. This does not, however, rule out the participation of a specific priest, known as the *flamen Carmentalis*, devoted to the worship of this deity; cf. Cic. *Brut.* 56 *qui cum consul esset eodemque tempore sacrificium publicum cum laena faceret, quod erat flamen Carmentalis* (M. Popilius Laenas, cos. 356 B.C., who received his cognomen from his tenure of the post), *CIL* 6.3720.

463 te quoque lux eadem, Turni soror, aede recepit "the same day also received you in a temple, o sister of Turnus": *Turni soror* refers to the water nymph Juturna, who is recognised as the sister of Turnus previously only by Vergil; cf. Verg. *A.* 12. 138ff. *Turni sic est adfata sororem/diva deam . . . 'nympha, decus fluviorum'.* She was honoured on 11th January (*Fasti Antiates Maiores* [Degrassi 2]) by Q. Lutatius Catulus, who built a temple to her on the Campus Martius following his victory in the first Punic War; cf. Serv. *A.* 12.139, Platner/Ashby 308, Steinby III.162–3. Juturna was apparently honoured in this way because of her service of providing water for all Roman sacrifices; cf. Serv. *A.* 12.139 *nam et Iuturnas ferias celebrant qui artificium aqua exercent, quem diem festum Iuturnalia dicunt.* The localisation of her temple through the reference to the 'Virgin Water' (464n.) is, however, an ironic touch, given that Juturna's divine status is a direct consequence of her *loss* of virginity (by Jupiter); cf. Verg. *A.* 12.138–41, 878.

464 hic ubi Virginea Campus obitur aqua "here where the Campus is traversed by the Virgin water": the 'Virgin Water' refers to the famous aqueduct built by Agrippa in 19 B.C., called Aqua Virgo, apparently in honour of the fact that it was a maiden who originally pointed out the source to the soldiers; cf. Fron. *Aq.* 10, Plin. *Nat.* 31.42. Ovid alludes to the fact that the arches of the aqueduct passed along the Campus, on the north side of the Saepta, where they provided water for the Roman baths; cf. Fron. *Aq.* 22, Platner/Ashby 28–9, Zanker (1988) 139–40, Steinby I.72–3; see also 463n.

For *obeo* in the specific sense 'travel across', cf. *Her.* 16.177–8 *ora . . . finibus immensis vix obeunda,* Cic. *Ver.* 1.6 *ego Siciliam totam quinquaginta diebus sic obii,* Lucr. 5.618, Verg. *A.* 6.801, *Thes.* 9.2.47.75ff. Since the verb usually implies motion, Ovid may be referring specifically to the flow of water in the aqueduct. For the mimetic approach to topography (*hic ubi*), see 243–4n.

465 unde petam causas horum moremque sacrorum: Ovid sets out a two-part enquiry: the reason for giving honour to Carmentis (*causas*), and the manner in which her festival is celebrated (*morem*); for the tradition of the 'double enquiry', see 89–92n. Ovid will then follow this order: the *causa* is explained in terms of her pivotal contribution to the foundation of Rome (469–586), and the *mos* of the festival is related under the entry for 15th January (617–36).

466 deriget in medio quis mea vela freto?: the progress of a poem is regularly compared to the voyage of a ship; see 4n. The specific correlation here—the poem in mid-flow represented as a ship in mid-ocean—is also occasionally found elsewhere; cf. *Ars* 2.9–10 *mediis tua pinus in undis/navigat*, *Rem.* 577–8 *media navem Palinurus in unda/deserit*, Prop. 4.1.147. The 'navigator/source of information' for this section turns out to be Carmentis (467ff.), who is particularly suited to the task given that she goes on to show her skill at guiding the physical ship of Evander; cf. 499–500 *iamque ratem doctae monitu Carmentis in amnem/egerat.*

467 quae nomen habes a carmine ductum: the etymology of Carmentis from her status as prophetess is very popular; most commonly, as here, from *carmen* ('prophetic utterance'), cf. Dion. Hal. 1.31.1, Plu. *Mor.* 278b–d, [Aur. Vict.] *Orig.* 5.2, Isid. *Orig.* 1.4.1; from *cano*, cf. Serv. *A.* 8.336 *quod divinatione fata caneret*, O'Hara (1996) 100, 209; from *carens mente* ('devoid of mind', a reference to her frenzied state), cf. Plu. *Rom.* 21.3; see further Dumézil (1970) 392–4. Ovid here is also taking *carmen* in the sense 'poem', calling on her roots in song to inspire his own *carmen.* There may even be a double entendre here: can we also translate 'you who draw your name from *a* poem (i.e. *Aeneid*)'?

468 propositoque fave: a formula used elsewhere to seek favour for a (written) enterprise; cf. Lygd. 6.9 *vos modo proposito dulces faveatis amici*, Sen. *Dial.* 2.9.4, Plin. *Pan.* 95.3. *propositum* is infrequent in poetry outside Ovid; for statistics, see Navarro-Antolín on Lygd. 6.9.

ne tuus erret honor "lest the honour (given) to you be erroneous": Ovid asks for Carmentis' help so that he may relate an accurate account of her importance. For *erro* in the sense 'to be erroneous', cf. e.g. Man. 3.387–9, Sen. *Ep.* 71.3, Tac. *Ag.* 9.5 *haud semper errat fama*, *Thes.* 5.2.812.14ff. There may, however, be problems with this sentiment: far from ensuring accuracy, Carmentis' aid may in fact create a biased telling of the story; see 474n.

469–542 The Foundation of Pallanteum

i. *Sources and Inspiration*

Evander, an Arcadian exiled from his native land, travels to Italy under the guidance of his prophetic mother Carmentis and founds Pallanteum, the future site of Rome. The general features of the legend are already established in the early Roman historians, and were probably introduced into the Roman story during fourth to third century B.C.; cf. Cato *Orig.* fr. 19, 56 Peter, Liv. 1.7.8, Verg. *A.* 8.51–4, 333–6 *me pulsum patria pelagique extrema sequentem/Fortuna omnipotens et ineluctabile fatum/his posuere locis, matrisque egere tremenda/Carmentis nymphae monita et deus auctor Apollo* (reminiscences of the aged Evander), Dion. Hal. 1.31, 1.79.4ff. (mentioning Fabius Pictor, Lucius Cincius, Cato and Calpurnius Piso as sources), Prop. 4.1.3–4, [Aur. Vict.] *Orig.* 5, Paus. 8.43.2, *RE* 6.1.839.63ff., Cornell (1995) 68ff. Nowhere else in extant literature is this foundation story more elaborately told than here. That said, Ovid's story clearly invites reflection on Vergil's *Aeneid,* in terms of characters involved (Evander and Carmentis), structure and register.

Vergil had most famously brought Evander to life as an aged, fatherly figure in *Aeneid* 8–11. Ovid, by contrast, takes us back to the youthful days of Evander: the events narrated with hindsight by Vergil's Evander (Verg. *A.* 8.333–6) are in Ovid witnessed as they occur. Ovid's reasons for doing this are multiple. First, it allows Ovid to narrate an important stage in the history of the foundation of Rome without directly rivalling his eminent predecessor. Secondly, in depicting Evander as a young and inexperienced individual, Ovid can focus on the dominant and guiding force of his mother Carmentis, which is entirely appropriate in a section set up to answer why Carmentis should be honoured in the Roman calendar (465). To this end, the difference between Carmentis and Evander in this story is stark. Carmentis provides constant support to her son: she heartens him with words of consolation (479–96) and a prophecy (515–36), and guides him in the physical task of steering the ship (499–500). Evander, by contrast, is a weak (479 *flenti*), passive (497–500) and colourless character who, quite unlike his Vergilian counterpart, is given no speaking part at all. For the possible overtones of the dominant relationship of Livia over her son Tiberius, see 515–36 (ii) n.

Ovid, then, sets himself apart from Vergil in his depiction of Evander. However, in terms of structure, Ovid clearly has *Aeneid* in mind, as his story recalls the Vergilian epic in miniature: both stories commence with a forlorn, fugitive individual at sea (477ff., Verg. *A.* 1.92ff.) and involve a prophecy of the future glory of Rome (515ff., Verg. *A.* 1.257ff., 6.756ff.) before the eventual securing of a location for building a settlement (541–2). Moreover, Ovid's tale is related in a noticeably sustained high register (see individual nn.), suggesting an epic 'weightiness' to his story.

ii. *The Role of Evander in the poem*

This is the first of several references to Evander in the poem—cf. also 2.279–80, 4.65, 5.91–100, 643–8, 6.505–6—and he is a character of considerable importance to Ovid's work.

First, the presence of Evander introduces us to an important Greek founder figure for Rome to complement the Latin founder figure of Romulus, established earlier at 27 (*conditor Urbis*). These are, in fact, the only two characters acknowledged as founder figures in *Fasti*, representing different stages of the Palatine settlement, and they enjoy near parity in the poem; cf. 2.267–450 (Lupercalia) and 4.55–8, 65–66 (both are acknowledged together as originating rites). Aeneas, by contrast, the founder figure par excellence established by Vergil and the chronological link between the two, is nowhere in the poem specifically acknowledged as one of the founders of Rome. He is most often referred to simply as a bringer of cult (cf. 3.423–4, 4.77–8, 251–2, 6.434), or viewed in his iconic position as carrier of his father and the sacred items from the burning Troy (cf. 527–8 with n., 4.37–8). Even when Ovid does remind us of some of the details of Aeneas' voyage to Italy and subsequent war, there is no reference to the foundation of a city; cf. 2.679–80 (he landed in Laurentine territory), 3.601–2 (he gained the kingdom and Lavinia), esp. 4.879–80 *Turnus an Aeneas Latiae gener esset Amatae/bellum erat* (the war with the Latins was for the sake of a wife, not the foundation of a great city). The detailed narration of Evander's foundation of a settlement, as well as the subordination of Aeneas in this regard, allows Ovid to establish his own literary space distinct from that of Vergil; see further Fantham (1992a) 155–66.

There may, however, be another, more personal reason for Ovid's focus on Evander, especially in Book 1. Given that Book 1 shows the greatest signs of comprehensive revision from exile (see Introduction, II), it has been suggested that Ovid may have seen in Evander a surrogate for his own forlorn status; see Fantham (1992a) 166–70. The story is indeed shaped in such as way as to invite reflection on Ovid's own exilic predicament, though the correlation is by no means exact; see 479–96n.

469–70 The land to which Ovid refers here is Arcadia, which traditionally takes its name from Arcas, son of Jupiter and Callisto (cf. 2.155–92, *Met.* 2.409–507), who is said to have introduced the cultivation of corn to the country and taught its people various skills; cf. Paus. 8.4.1. Arcadia is popularly known as the land which 'rose before the moon' (*orta prior luna*... *tellus*), and its inhabitants 'prelunar'; cf. 2.289–90, 5.90, Call. *Iamb.* 1. fr. 151.56 Pf., Lyc. *Alex.* 479ff., Ap. Rhod. 4.264–5 Ἀρκάδες οἳ καὶ πρόσθε σεληναίης ὑδέονται/ζώειν, Cens. 19.5 *Arcades*... *ob id proselenoe appellati*, Frazer on 469. The reasons offered for this curious epithet are varied; cf. scholiast on Ap. Rhod. 4.264 (the Arcadians got their name by expelling barbarians from their country before the rising of the moon), Cens. 19.5 (they are 'prelunar' because their year was not regulated by the course of the moon).

469 de se si creditur ipsi "if one can believe a land (when it talks) about itself": an expression of scepticism is entirely appropriate to the re-telling of an extraordinary piece of information, particularly in didactic discourse where it serves to establish the proper objective tone; cf. e.g. 2.413–14 *venit ad expositos, mirum, lupa feta gemellos:/quis credat pueris non nocuisse feram?*, Verg. *G.* 3.391, Bömer on 2.203; T. Stinton (1976), "'*Si credere dignum est*': some expressions of disbelief in Euripides and others", *PCPhS* 22, 63ff.; Porte (1985) 67ff. However, Ovid appears to be extending the motif here. He does not merely advise a cautionary stance on the grounds of the extraordinary nature of the tale; he is also concerned that natives may be prone to exaggerate or glamorise the legend surrounding their own particular land; cf. *Pont.* 1.8.13 *de se si credimus ipsis* (the Caspians telling a tale about themselves). This may have implications for the 'reliability' of the present story; see also 474n.

471 Euander: see 469–542n.

471–2 quamquam clarus utroque,/nobilior sacrae sanguine matris erat: Livy also suggests that Evander is more distinguished by virtue of his mother than his (unnamed) father; cf. Liv. 1.7.8: *Evander . . . venerabilior divinitate credita Carmentae matris.* The most popular tradition names Mercury/Hermes as Evander's father; cf. Verg. *A.* 8.138–9, Dion. Hal. 1.31, [Aur. Vict.] *Orig.* 5, Paus. 8.43.2. It would seem odd (or bold) for Ovid to suggest that Carmentis is a more distinguished deity than Mercury. For this reason, it appears more likely that he is (with Livy) alluding to a different tradition; cf. e.g. Serv. *A.* 8.130 *quidam aiunt . . . quam duxit uxorem Echemus Arcas, cuius filius Evander.*

473 simul aetherios animo conceperat ignes: in preparation for the giving of prophecy, the body of the priestess is taken over by a divine entity, which leaves the mortal maddened and burning; cf. 6.537–8 (Carmentis), *Met.* 2.640–1 *ergo ubi vaticinos concepit mente furores/incaluitque deo, quem clausum pectore habebat* (Ocyrhoe), 14.107, Verg. *A.* 6.46–51, 77–80, 100–2 (Sibyl). For *aetherius* synonymous with *divinus*, cf. e.g. Verg. *A.* 7.281, Stat. *Theb.* 6.378–9, *Thes.* 1.1153.76ff.

474 ore dabat pleno carmina vera dei "she uttered truthful prophecies from a mouth possessed by the god": the MSS are split between the readings *pleno . . . vera* (**AUω**) and *vero . . . plena* (**Mς**). The present reading is more difficult, but preferable on the grounds that Ovid enjoys transferring epithet (here *pleno*) from person to mouth; cf. *sacrifico . . . ore* (130 with n.), *praescia lingua* (538 with n.).

vera: stress is put on the authority that Carmentis commands in the sphere of prophecy; cf. 476 *tempore nacta fidem*, 477 *nimium vera . . . matre*, 496 *crede mihi*, 499 *doctae . . . Carmentis.* This emphasis may serve to reinforce her claim to a festival in the Roman calendar. It may, alternatively, serve to undermine subtly the authority of the story, especially given that Carmentis is strongly influencing the telling of the tale (467–8), and that we have been warned to be sceptical about those who talk about themselves (469); for the argument, see Barchiesi (1997) 197ff.; see also 481–2n.

475 dixerat haec nato motus instare sibique "she had said that upheavals were at hand for both her son and herself": *motus*, a colourless noun which takes its sense from the context, is best translated here as 'changes in circumstance, upheavals'; cf. e.g. Cic. *Sest.* 99, *Fin.* 5.71 *qui omnis motus fortunae mutationesque rerum . . . intellegant*, Caes. *Gal.* 6.5.2, *Thes.* 8.1537.25ff. The phraseology seems to

be typical in expressions of prophetic prediction; cf. e.g. *Met.* 8.772–3 *tibi factorum poenas instare tuorum/vaticinor moriens* (nymph to Erysichthon), 15. 794–5 *magnosque instare tumultus/fibra monet*, Cic. *Div.* 1.112, Verg. *G.* 1.464–5 *ille etiam caecos instare tumultus/saepe monet* (the Sun).

476 multaque praeterea tempore nacta fidem "and many things besides which, in time, gained credibility": for *fides* in the sense of 'credibility', see 359n. For the emphasis on the truth of Carmentis, see 474n.

477 nimium vera . . . matre: see 474n.

fugatus: a common feature of a foundation story is that the individual, destined to found a new city, is originally forced to leave his native land; cf. e.g. 4.73–4 (Halaesus), *Met.* 3.6–8 *orbe pererrato . . ./ profugus patriamque iramque parentis/vitat* (Cadmus), 3.538–9 (men who founded Tyre), Verg. *A.* 1.1–2 (Aeneas). The reason for Evander's expulsion is not given here, but there are variant traditions. The most sinister traditions suggest that Evander is expelled for murdering either his mother or his father (at the bidding of his mother); cf. Serv. *A.* 8.51, 333. If Carmentis can be trusted when she claims later that Evander's plight occurs through no fault of his own (481–2 with n.), it is likely that Ovid is either following a different tradition—cf. Dion. Hal. 1.31, who speaks in vague terms of a sedition that arises among the people in Arcadia, causing Evander and his mother to flee—or shaping the tradition for his own ends; see 479–96n., 481–2n.

478 Parrhasiumque larem: the Parrhasians were an ancient tribe in Arcadia; cf. Str. 8.8.1, Paus. 8.27.4. From here, the name became a popular metonym for Arcadia; cf. 618 *Parrhasiae . . . deae* (Carmentis), 4.577, *Met.* 8.315, *Tr.* 2.190, Verg. *A.* 8.344, 11.31 *Parrhasio Evandro.*

479–96 In her initial address, Carmentis attempts to console her son by putting his exile into some sort of perspective and promising better times to come. Her speech bears all the hallmarks of a *consolatio*, a rhetorical form designed to offer consolation to a forlorn individual. Practised by Greek philosophers and introduced into Latin by Cicero, the *consolatio* is popular is both poetry and prose, and usually takes the form of an address to a bereaved individual on the death of a close acquaintance; for examples in prose, cf. e.g. Cic. *Fam.* 4.5, 5.16, Sen. *Ep.* 63, 99; in poetry, cf. *Pont.* 4.11, Hor. *Carm.* 1.24 with Nisbet/Hubbard ad loc., *Epic. Drusi*, Stat. *Silv.* 2.1 with Van Dam ad loc.; see further Scourfield (1993) 15–23. Cicero, how-

ever, speaks of a specific branch of the *consolatio* directed towards the comforting of exiles—*Tusc.* 3.81 *separatim certae scholae sunt de exilio*—and the most notable examples are Philiscus' consolation to the exiled Cicero (Dio 38.18ff.) and Seneca's 'self-consolation' to his mother Helvia (*Dial.* 12); for the history and development of the genre, see Claassen (1999) 19ff.

The motifs and consolation tactics adopted by Carmentis in her speech are, therefore, well-rehearsed by Ovid's day (see nn.). However, the situation here is unique in that it is a strong *woman* consoling an aggrieved *man* (see esp. 479 *viriliter* n.). This gender role-reversal only enhances the characterisation of Carmentis as the source of mental and physical strength to her passive and weak son; see 469–542n.

The very general nature of Carmentis' address has also led some to suggest that this section is loaded with allusions to Ovid's own predicament in exile; see Fantham (1992a) 166–70. First, some of the phraseology employed here to describe Evander's plight is used directly by Ovid to describe his own plight in exile; see esp. 481–4nn. Moreover, elsewhere in *Fasti*, Ovid shows that relating the plight of mythical exiles can remind him of his own predicament, to such a degree that he interrupts the poem with personal comments; cf. 4.79–82 *huius erat Solimus Phrygia comes unus ab Ida,/ . . . Sulmonis gelidi, patriae, Germanice, nostrae./me miserum, Scythico quam procul illa solo est!*

We should note, however, a crucial difference between the plights of the two exiles. At 481, Carmentis asserts that Evander is entirely blameless for his exile: *nec te tua culpa fugavit.* Nowhere in his exilic poetry does Ovid venture to the Emperor so bold an assertion about his own exile. Though he insists that his offence was not due to deliberate malicious intent (*crimen*), and even goes as far as to say that he believes his punishment may be excessive (cf. *Tr.* 2.545–6), he nevertheless regularly admits a certain degree of *culpa*; cf. e.g. *Tr.* 1.2.98, 2.103–4 *cur aliquid vidi? cur noxia lumina feci?/cur imprudenti cognita culpa mihi?*, 3.1.51–2, 4.1.23–4 *scit quoque, cum perii, quis me deceperit error,/et culpam in facto, non scelus, esse meo*, 5.4.18, *Pont.* 2.2.15.

There is no straightforward mapping of Evander's plight on to Ovid's. That said, the reader would be entirely justified to detect in Evander at least a shade of the exiled poet himself; on the reader's 'post-exilic' standpoint, see Introduction, II.

479–80 "To her weeping son the mother said, 'You must bear this fortune of yours like a man: check your tears, I pray' ": Carmentis'

sentiment here follows the standard practice of the *consolatio*. *fortuna*, often identified with the Greek τύχη (see 479n.), is the force which causes the vicissitudes in human life, to which all mortals are subservient. It is frequently mentioned in the *consolatio* so as to comfort the aggrieved with the thought that there is nothing they could have done to prevent their present predicament; cf. e.g. Cic. *Fam.* 4.5.6, 5.16.2 *est autem consolatio pervulgata quidem illa maxime... ut omnibus telis fortunae proposita sit vita nostra*, Sen. *Ep.* 63.7, 99.9, *Dial.* 12.4, *Epic. Drusi* 51–2 *nempe per hos etiam Fortunae iniuriae mores/regnat, et incerta est hic quoque nixa rota*, 371–4, Dio 38.24.6 (Cicero is reminded that his exile was due to fortune).

As here, the consoler would also regularly attempt to call for an end to lamentation, on the grounds that it was pointless and would not alter the situation; cf. e.g. Cic. *Tusc.* 3.77 *tertia [medicina in consolationibus] summam esse stultitiam frustra confici maerore, cum intellegas nihil posse profici*, *Fam.* 4.5.6, Sen. *Ep.* 99.6, *Epic. Drusi* 427–8 *supprime iam lacrimas: non est revocabilis istis,/quem semel umbrifera navita lintre tulit.* Furthermore, as Carmentis hints by her use of *viriliter*, it is customary for an aggrieved man to be dissuaded from excessive displays of emotion, an act typically branded as 'soft' or 'womanly'; cf. Cic. *Fam.* 5.16.6, Sen. *Ep.* 63.1ff., 99.2 *solacia expectas? convicia accipe. molliter tu fers mortem filii*, Dio 38.18.1 οὐκ αἰσχύνῃ,... ὦ Κικέρων, θρηνῶν καὶ γυναικείως διακείμενος, 38.25.3 ἀνδρείως φέρειν τὰ δόξαντα τῷ δαίμονι καὶ καλὸν καὶ ἀναγκαῖόν ἐστιν, Scourfield on Jerome *Ep.* 60.7.3. This latter point is, however, all the more striking for its being uttered by a woman.

479 genetrix is an elevated word, found predominantly in high poetry; for statistics, cf. Ov. (32, *Met.* [24], *Fasti* [4]), Lucr. (3), Cat. (1), Verg. (14, once in *G.*, 13 in *A.*), Hor. (1), Prop. (0), Tib. (0).

Interestingly, the scene here of a divine mother asking her weeping son to cease his lamentation and listen to her words of consolation takes us back to Cyrene and Aristaeus; cf. *flenti* (479), *flebat Aristaeus* (363); *genetrix* (365, 479); *siste, precor, lacrimas* (480), *siste, puer, lacrimas* (367). Though the two stories are subsequently very different, this similarity helps to increase the sense of continuity and flow between different episodes in different parts of the calendar; see also 560n.

fortuna viriliter: *fortuna*, akin to τύχη, is the fickle force which causes the vicissitudes in human life; see especially I. Kajanto (1961), *Ovid's Conception of Fate*, Turka, 29ff. *fortuna* is not incompatible with *fatis* (481). In simple terms, *fortuna* is responsible for the immediate changeable circumstances, whereas *fatum* is the preordained course

of events. The two are therefore often expressed together as factors which cause exile, most notably in the case of Vergil's Evander; cf. Verg. *A.* 8.334–5 *Fortuna omnipotens et ineluctabile fatum/his posuere locis* (Evander), Ov. *Pont.* 2.7.15–18 (Ovid), Sen. *Dial.* 11.3.3–5 (Polybius).

viriliter, used by Ovid only here and found elsewhere in Augustan poetry only at Hor. *Ep.* 1.17.38, is an emphatic adverb particularly at home in philosophical discourse, where it evokes the notions of a man's courage and steadfastness in adversity; cf. Cic. *Tusc.* 2.65, *Off.* 1.27.94, Hor. *Ep.* 1.17.38, Sen. *Ep.* 124.3 *inprobamus . . . qui nihil viriliter ausuri sunt doloris metu.*

Since the words *fortuna viriliter* are clearly separated from the rest of Carmentis' utterance, Ovid may be intending an allusion to the cult of Fortuna Virilis, ascribed to Servius Tullius (Plu. *Mor.* 281d–f, 323a), which may have had a temple on the Forum Boarium next to that of Hercules Victor; Platner/Ashby 219, Steinby II.280. Is Ovid perhaps subtly forging an aetiology for this cult from Carmentis' words of encouragement to Evander?

481 sic erat in fatis: the idiom *in fato/fatis esse* is first used by Ovid; cf. *Met.* 1.256 *esse quoque in fatis reminiscitur* (Jupiter), *Tr.* 3.2.1, *Pont.* 1.7.56, *Thes.* 6.1.366.40ff. *fatum* here represents the power that works in the interest of Rome, guiding those individuals who will contribute to its foundation; cf. *Met.* 13.623–4 *non tamen eversam Troiae cum moenibus esse/spem quoque fata sinunt,* Verg. *A.* 1.2 *fato profugus* (Aeneas). Carmentis' sentiment is again consistent with the tactics of the *consolatio* since, as with *fortuna* (see 479–80n.), reference to fate serves to cheer the forlorn individual with the thought that his predicament is outside his control.

481–2 nec te tua culpa fugavit,/sed deus: offenso pulsus es urbe deo: the diaeresis of *sed deus* and the polyptoton in *deus . . . deo* is an emphatic way of reinforcing the point that Evander's current predicament is outside his control.

No other account of the Evander myth attributes his exile to the anger of a god; for other traditions of the Evander myth, see 477n. It is possible that Ovid is attempting to forge a link between Evander's plight and his own exile, which he likewise attributes to an injured godhead, namely that of Augustus; cf. e.g. *Tr.* 1.10.41–2 *Miletida . . . ad urbem,/offensi quo me conpulit ira dei,* 5.10.52, *Pont.* 1.10.42; see also 479–96n., 483n. Alternatively, or as well as this, Ovid may be attempting to forge a link between Evander's story and the tradition of Aeneas established by Vergil, whilst at the same time distancing

Evander from some of the more sinister traditions (see 477n.). There are indeed certain similarities between 481–4 and Verg. *A.* 1.1–11. In 481–4, Ovid sets up a contrast between the anger of the divine and the innocence of a mortal, and this is the same fundamental contrast that Vergil makes; cf. Verg. *A.* 1.9–11 *quidve dolens regina deum tot volvere casus/insignem pietate virum, tot adire labores/impulerit. tantaene animis caelestibus irae.* Evander's plight is caused by *offenso . . . deo* (482), *numinis iram* (483), and this mirrors Aeneas' predicament; cf. Verg. *A.* 1.4 *Iunonis ob iram,* 8 *numine laeso*; for the Vergilian influence in this section, see 469–542n., 543–82n. The apparent uniqueness of the claim in 481–2 may even cast doubt on the reliability of the primary narrator, Carmentis; see 474n.

483 non meriti poenam pateris "you are not suffering the punishment for a wrong-doing": *meritum* is here used in the negative sense of an act meriting blame; cf. *Am.* 2.2.49, 3.3.15–16 *dicite, di, si vos impune fefellerat illa,/alterius meriti cur ego damna tuli?, Pont.* 1.2.96, 3.3.76, Pl. *Am.* 182, *Poen.* 882, *Thes.* 8.814.51ff.

numinis iram: a phrase which Ovid often uses to describe the anger of the deity (Augustus) that caused his own exile; cf. e.g. *Tr.* 1.5.43–4 *oro,/deminui siqua numinis ira potest,* 3.6.23, 4.8.50, 5.4.17; see also 481–2n.

484 est aliquid magnis crimen abesse malis "it is something (of real significance) that guilt is absent in these great misfortunes": a final, emphatic consolatory remark, following on from 481–3. It is an important task of the consoler to show that there is no personal wrong-doing involved in the sufferer's present misfortune; cf. Cic. *Tusc.* 3.77 *erit igitur in consolationibus prima medicina docere aut nullum malum esse aut admodum parvum, Fam.* 5.16.4, 5 (no evil in death), Dio 38.27.4 οὔτε γὰρ ἐξ ἀδικίας ἐξελήλασαι (Philiscus to Cicero). Carmentis' sentiment is equally applicable to Ovid's own exile, during which he consistently takes heart in the fact that his fault comes from error rather than criminal intent; cf. e.g. *Tr.* 1.3.37–8 *caelestique viro, quis me deceperit error,/dicite, pro culpa ne scelus esse putet,* 2.92, 3.1.52, 3.11.34, 4.1.23–4, 4.10.90; see also 479–96n.

The idiom *est aliquid* is first found in Ovid; cf. 6.27 *est aliquid nupsisse Iovi, Iovis esse sororem* (Juno), *Met.* 12.93–4 *est aliquid non esse satum Nereide, sed qui/Nereaque et natas et totum temperat aequor* (Cycnus), 13.241–2, *Tr.* 5.1.59, *Pont.* 2.7.65, 2.10.39, 3.4.18, *Thes.* 1.1614.51ff.

485–6 "As there is to each man a conscious mind, so it conceives within his breast, according to his actions, either hope or fear": a

sentiment with a philosophical ring. In the present circumstance, Carmentis is implying (following on from 484) that Evander's guiltless conscience should spur on hope and confidence; cf. e.g. 4.311 *conscia mens recti famae mendacia risit* (innocence spurs on Claudia Quinta amidst malicious rumour), Verg. *A.* 1.603–5 *di tibi . . . et mens sibi conscia recti,/praemia digna ferant* (Aeneas to Dido). The negative side of this—that a guilty conscience brings with it fear—is elaborately dealt with in Democritean and Epicurean thought; cf. Democr. fr. 297 Diels, Lucr. 3.1018ff. *at mens sibi conscia factis/praemetuens adhibet stimulos torretque flagellis . . . atque eadem metuit magis haec ne in morte gravescant,* Sen. *Ep.* 97.14–15, [Quint.] *Decl.* 12.28, Juv. 13.192–5.

487–92 In a new strategy to console her son, Carmentis mentions three previous famous exiles—Cadmus (489–90), Tydeus (491) and Jason (491)—who have had to endure the sort of hardship Evander is facing now, only to find happiness in a new land. The recollecting of notable previous individuals who have undergone the same experience, which reminds the victim that he is not alone in such strife, is a standard tactic of consolation literature; cf. *Met.* 15.493–5 *siste modum . . . neque enim fortuna querenda/sola tua est; similes aliorum respice casus:/mitius ista feres* (Hippolytus to Egeria), Cic. *Fam.* 5.16.2 *eventisque aliorum memoria repetendis, nihil accidisse novi nobis cogitemus, Tusc.* 3.79. It is a standard feature of all types of consolations to those who have lost a close acquaintance; cf. e.g. Cic. *Fam.* 4.5.4, Hor. *Carm.* 1.28.7 with Nisbet/Hubbard ad loc., Prop. 3.18.27–8, Sen. *Ep.* 99.22, *Epic. Drusi* 429ff. More specifically, it is widely used in the comforting of exiles, as in the cases of Ovid himself (*Pont.* 1.3.61ff.), Cicero (Dio 38.26.3) and Seneca (Sen. *Dial.* 12.7.5ff.).

The three mythical exiles mentioned in these lines appear again in close proximity in one of Ovid's exilic epistles. In *Pont.* 1.3, Ovid replies to a friend Rufinus, who has previously sent him a letter of consolation. These three mythical characters are mentioned by Ovid (*Pont.* 1.3.75–9) as part of a catalogue of exiles which, though intended to console a forlorn individual like himself, have no effect on him, because he deems the lands inhabited by other exiles a lot more hospitable than his (*Pont.* 1.3.83–4). If we read 487–92 in the light of Ovid's exile, a certain irony is apparent: Carmentis is uttering the sort of consolatory remarks which, though suitable for Evander, prove ineffective for his own plight (Fantham (1992a) 168).

However we interpret these lines, it is not difficult to see why Carmentis might draw on these particular characters. The catalogue

of exiles at *Pont.* 1.3.61ff. is most varied, including Roman figures (Rutilius Rufus), Athenian statesmen (Themistocles and Aristides) as well as mythical heroes (Patroclus, Jason, Cadmus, Tydeus and Teucer). Carmentis' choice is, however, ultimately limited by her position on the mythical timeline. Nevertheless, the *exempla* are well-chosen: Evander can draw considerable comfort from the fact that even criminal fugitives (Tydeus and Jason) can achieve prosperity in a new land.

488 obruit "overwhelmed": the verb has a limited force here, as each exile does eventually overcome difficulty.

procella: in the metaphorical sense 'adverse circumstance'; cf. e.g. *Met.* 13.656–7 *ne non ex aliqua vestram sensisse procellam/nos quoque parte putes* (Anius), *Tr.* 5.12.5, *Pont.* 2.7.54, Cic. *Clu.* 153, Verg. *A.* 7.594, *Thes.* 10.2.1511.29ff.

489–90 Cadmus is driven from his Phoenician homeland by his father, who orders him to find his lost sister Europa and threatens him with banishment if he should fail. Unable to find his sister, and effectively exiled, Cadmus consults the oracle of Apollo, under whose guidance he eventually founds the city of Thebes in the land of Boeotia; for the legend, cf. *Met.* 3.1–137, Eur. *Ph.* 638–75, Hyg. *Fab.* 178, Nonn. *D.* 4.285ff., Fontenrose (1959) 306ff., *LIMC* 5.1.863ff.

489 passus idem: the anaphora of this phrase at the start of successive couplets (491), as well as the general repetition of *passus* (487, 489, 491) and *idem* (489, 491 (twice)), presses home the idea that Evander is not alone in his suffering.

qui quondam pulsus ab oris: this has a grand ring to it, recalling in both rhythm and phraseology the first line of *Aeneid: arma virumque cano, Troiae qui primus ab oris.*

490 in Aonia . . . humo: the Aonians were an ancient tribe who were defeated by Cadmus on his arrival to the new land. They begged for mercy and were subsequently united with the Phoenicians; cf. Paus. 9.5.1. *Aonius* is often used by poets as a learned epithet for 'Boeotian' (cf. *Met.* 1.313, 7.763, Call. *Ap.* 75, *Thes.* 2.204.58ff.), but here it retains its literal meaning, recalling the state of the land at the time of Cadmus' arrival.

491 Tydeus, son of Oeneus, is banished from Calydon on account of murder. He finds more prosperous times in Argos, where the king Adrastus offers him his daughter's hand in marriage, by whom he has a son Diomedes; cf. Hom. *Il.* 14.113ff., Apollod. 1.8.5, *RE* 7A. 2.1702.43ff. Evander should perhaps draw particular comfort from this example, since Tydeus finds happiness after exile even though, unlike himself (484), he is guilty of a crime.

Pagasaeus Iason: Jason essentially undergoes two experiences which might be referred to as exile, and on both occasions he finds better times. First, Pelias, the king of Thessaly, fearing that Jason is the man destined to overthrow him, sends him away to Colchis on a seemingly impossible quest to fetch the golden fleece. There he meets the king's daughter, Medea, who helps him to achieve his goal; cf. *Met.* 7.1ff., Pind. *Pyth.* 4.71ff., Ap. Rhod., Apollod. 1.9.16ff. Later, Jason and Medea are exiled from Iolcus for murdering Pelias, but they both find refuge in Corinth; cf. e.g. *Met.* 7.391ff., *LIMC* 5.1.629ff. Again, Evander ought to draw comfort from the fact that Jason prospers despite committing crimes.

Pagasae is the port in Thessaly at which the Argo is constructed and from which it sets sail on its epic voyage (Ap. Rhod. 1.237–8), and the adjective *Pagasaeus*, first found in Ovid, is used in different contexts; cf. 5.401 *Pagasaeis collibus* ('Thessalian' hills), *Met.* 7.1 *Pagasaea puppe*, 13.24 *Pagasaea carina* (the Argo), *Her.* 16.347, 19.175 (*Pagasaeus Iason*), *Ars* 3.19 (Alcestis of Thessaly). This learned epithet finds favour with later epic poets; cf. e.g. Luc. 2.715, 6.400, Stat. *Ach.* 1.65, V. Fl. 5.435, 7.556, 8.378.

492 et quos praeterea longa referre mora est "and those individuals besides whom it would take a long time to mention": a statement which purports to pass over certain information is a form of *praeteritio*, a standard rhetorical device used for a variety of effects; see K.-St. II.2.118f., Lucke on *Rem.* 461. Here, the technique is employed to end a particular catalogue of detail (famous exiles), thus allowing the speaker to proceed to a new line of argument whilst creating the impression that the closure of the list is by no means due to lack of material; cf. e.g. 5.311 *longa referre mora est correcta oblivia damnis* (Flora ends her list of negligent worshippers), *Rem.* 461, *Met.* 3.225 *quosque referre mora est* (catalogue of Actaeon's hounds), 4.16, 5.207. It is a suitable device for the *consolatio*, as it is designed to cheer Evander with the belief that there is a considerable list of happy exiles.

493–4 "Every soil is to the brave his fatherland, just as the sea is to the fish, and whatever lies open in the clear vault of the sky is to the bird": the basic sentiment here—that the wise man can make his home anywhere—is a commonplace of popular philosophy going back to Democritus; cf. Democr. fr. 247 Diels, Curt. 6.4.13 *patriam esse, ubicumque vir fortis sedem sibi elegerit*, Otto (1890) 268. More specifically, the positive ideas of the entire world as habitable, and of exile as a mere change of (or, indeed, improvement in) location, are frequently impressed upon the banished by their comforters; cf.

Cic. *Tusc.* 5.106–9, Sen. *Dial.* 12.6ff. esp. 12.9.7 *ita te disciplinis imbuisti, ut scires omnem locum sapienti viro patriam esse,* Dio 38.26.2 καὶ αὐτὸς ἕκαστος αὐτῷ καὶ πατρίδα καὶ εὐδαιμονίαν ἀεὶ καὶ πανταχοῦ ποιεῖ (Philiscus to Cicero), Plu. *Mor.* 600e–601f, Claassen (1999) 87–8. In 493–4, however, the motif takes on global proportions, incorporating land, sea and sky with the analogy with fish and birds. This elevated utterance, befitting an inspired priestess, may have been specifically adapted from two famous lines of Euripides; cf. Eur. fr. 1047 N. ἅπας μὲν ἀὴρ αἰετῷ περάσιμος,/ἅπασα δὲ χθὼν ἀνδρὶ γενναίῳ πάτρις.

494 orbe "vault of the sky"; for the sense, cf. *Am.* 1.8.10 *puro fulget in orbe dies* (Aurora), *Pont.* 4.9.112, Tib. 1.2.52, *Thes.* 9.2.913.83ff.

495–6 "However, the wild tempest does not make you shiver all year long: for you too, believe me, there will be springtime": the vicissitudes of human fortune are often compared to changes in the weather. As such, the aggrieved may take consolation from the suggestion that the present inclement skies will eventually give way to fair weather; cf. e.g. *Tr.* 2.141–2 *sed solet interdum fieri placabile numen:/nube solet pulsa candidus ire dies, Pont.* 4.4.1–2, Hor. *Carm.* 2.9.1 with Nisbet/Hubbard ad loc., Prop. 2.28a.32.

However, the metaphor here is uniquely constructed in terms of the year (*anno*) and the changing seasons (*tempora veris*). It is perhaps fitting that the metaphor should take on 'annual dimensions' in a poem dealing with the calendar. It does, however, create a subtle sense of harmony between the narrative episode and the chronological progression of the poem, as Carmentis seems to be speaking as if she, like the poem, is in mid-January, when the weather is bad (315–16) and spring is the next season to come (in March and April, cf. 3.235–42, 4.125–32). Could *et tibi* (496) mean 'for you as well as the poem' in addition to 'for you as well as the other exiles'? For simultaneity between poem and year in general, see 2n.

495 horret, whose basic meaning is 'bristle, shiver', is hardly best translated 'rage' (Frazer, Nagle, Boyle/Woodard), 'tobt' (Bömer) or 'se déchaîne' (Schilling); nor does the translation 'shiver with cold', suggested at *Thes.* 6.3.2977.75ff., make much sense. It is perhaps best to translate the verb in a rarer, causative sense 'cause to/make shiver'; cf. Germ. *Arat.* 4.100–1 *Scorpios at raris . . . horrebit pluviis,* Luc. 1.445, V. Fl. 4.425, *Thes.* 6.3.2978.51ff. As such, the phrase expresses the common (poetic) sentiment that storms are a cause of dread to humans; cf. e.g. *Am.* 2.11.25 *navita sollicitus cum ventos horret iniquos,* Verg. *A.* 1.90–2, 12.451–5, Hor. *Carm.* 2.10.2–3 with Nisbet/Hubbard ad loc.

toto . . . in anno: *in* + ablative, in place of the accusative or temporal ablative, is an essentially poetic way to express duration; cf. *Her.* 8.91 *non tibi blanditias primis, mea mater, in annis* (Hermione), *Met.* 1.411, Cat. 21.3, Prop. 4.7.73, *Thes.* 7.778.15ff., 46ff.

496 crede mihi: a colloquial phrase—a favourite of Ovid's (for statistics, see McKeown on *Am.* 1.8.62)—which adds a personal note; cf. e.g. *Her.* 17.139, *Met.* 1.360–2 *quo consolante doleres?/namque ego, crede mihi, si te quoque pontus haberet,/te sequerer, coniunx* (Deucalion to Pyrrha), 14.31, Hofmann (1951) 126. For the emphasis on Carmentis' credibility, see 474n.

497 vocibus Euander firmata mente parentis "Evander, with his resolve strengthened by the words of his mother": *firmata* (**UMς**) is the majority reading, and the verb is regularly used in the metaphorical sense of the 'strengthening' of the mind; cf. *Rem.* 245–6 *quod nisi firmata properaris mente reverti,/inferet arma tibi saeva rebellis Amor*, *Pont.* 1.3.27 *cum bene firmarunt animum praecepta iacentem*, [Sen.] *Oct.* 929, *Thes.* 6.1.810.45ff.

498 nave secat fluctus: the idea of a ship 'cutting' the water and 'cleaving' a path through the sea is a poetic expression particularly at home in epic; cf. e.g. *Met.* 7.1 *iamque fretum Minyae Pagasaea puppe secabant*, 11.479, Hom. *Od.* 3.174–5, Cat. 64.12, Verg. *A.* 5.2, 10.147, 687, Hor. *Carm.* 1.1.14.

Hesperiamque tenet: *Hesperia* represents Evander's point of view, as it is precisely from the perspective of a native Greek that Italy becomes known as 'The Western Land'; cf. Ap. Rhod. 3.311, Enn. *Ann.* fr. 20 Sk., Verg. *A.* 1.530 *est locus, Hesperiam Grai cognomine dicunt*, Dion. Hal. 1.35.3. For *teneo* in the sense 'hold course for/reach', cf. e.g. 2.313, *Met.* 6.638, 11.257, Verg. *A.* 5.159, 9.98–9 *ubi defunctae finem portusque tenebunt/Ausonios olim*, Liv. 28.18.12, Tac. *Ag.* 38.4, *OLD* s.v. 5.

499–500 iamque ratem doctae monitu Carmentis in amnem/egerat: *doctus* is the established epithet for the *vates*; cf. *Met.* 3.322–3 *placuit quae sit sententia docti/quaerere Tiresiae*, Enn. *Ann.* fr. 15 Sk., Verg. *A.* 6.292 (the Sibyl), *Thes.* 5.1.1756.76ff. It does, however, add to the emphasis in this section on Carmentis' authority; see 474n. The sentence here is closely modelled on Evander's own words to Aeneas at Verg. *A.* 8.335–6—*matrisque <u>egere</u> tremenda/<u>Carmentis</u> nymphae <u>monita</u>*—though the 'dread warnings' of Vergil's Carmentis have been replaced with more gentle 'guidance' here.

500 Tuscis obvius ibat aquis: as the river Tiber formed the

eastern frontier of Etruria, it was often poetically referred to as 'Tuscan'; cf. e.g. 233, 4.294, 5.628, *Ars* 3.386, *Met.* 14.615, Verg. *A.* 8.473, Hor. *S.* 2.2.33, *Carm.* 3.7.28, Stat. *Silv.* 4.5.39–40. However, the reference here is also chronologically accurate for the time of Evander, given that, according to the tradition followed by Ovid, the river only receives the name Tiber after the drowning of the Latin king Tiberinus; cf. 2.389–40, 4.47–8, *Met.* 14.614–16, Var. *L.* 5.30, Liv. 1.3.8, Dion. Hal. 1.71.2.

obvius eo/venio (+ dative) 'to go/come against, to meet' is a predominantly poetic idiom, and an apparent favourite of Ovid's; cf. 4.294, *Her.* 6.143, *Am.* 1.6.39, 3.9.61, *Met.* 2.74–5 *poterisne rotatis/obvius ire polis, ne te citus auferat axis* (Sun to Phaethon), *Thes.* 9.2.320.11ff. The implication is that Evander is travelling against the current of the river to reach his new land, and this follows the experience of Vergil's Aeneas who, in reaching Pallanteum, must travel against the current; cf. Verg. *A.* 8.57–8 *ipse ego te ripis et recto flumine ducam,/adversum remis superes subvectus ut amnem* (Tiber to Aeneas).

501–2 fluminis illa latus, cui sunt vada iuncta Tarenti,/ aspicit "she caught sight of yonder side of the river, to which the shallows of Tarentum were joined": the Tarentum (also Terentum) refers to the land on the western tip of the Campus Martius, on which (later) stands an altar to Dis and Proserpina; cf. Fest. 479 L. *Terentum locus in campo Martio dictus, quod eo loco ara Ditis patris terra occultaretur*, Platner/Ashby 508–9. This is no idle landmark for Ovid to evoke. Tarentum was the original site of the Ludi Saeculares (cf. V. Max. 2.4.5), and the place where Augustus conducted the sacrifice during his spectacular staging of these games in 17 B.C.; see BNP I.201–6, esp. 202, Feeney (1998) 28–38.

502 sparsas per loca sola casas: a compact phrase which emphatically highlights the simplicity of the natives' lifestyle. *casa* is a very evocative term, as it is commonly used to describe the humble dwellings of early Rome, especially the *casa Romuli*; cf. Tib. 2.5.25–6 *sed tunc pascebant herbosa Palatia vaccae/et stabant humiles in Iovis arce casae*, Prop. 2.16.19–20, 4.1.6, Man. 4.27; for the *casa Romuli*, see 199n. Ovid here takes the term and applies it to the pre-Rome, pre-Pallanteum era; cf. 5.93–4 *hic, ubi nunc Roma est, orbis caput, arbor et herbae/et paucae pecudes et casa rara fuit* (the site at the time of Evander's arrival). *casae* are often mentioned in the context of a comparison between simplistic early Rome and the vast, wealthy capital that it becomes; as such, its usage here helps to anticipate the forthcoming

prophecy (509ff.), in which the glorious future of Rome is told.

503–6 In preparation for her prophecy, Carmentis displays the characteristic traits of the frenzied prophetess inspired by Apollo. Dishevelled hair (*immissis . . . capillis* (503)) is a standard feature; cf. *Am.* 1.9.38, *Her.* 5.114, 16.121 (Cassandra), Eur. *IA.* 757, Verg. *A.* 2.403ff., 6.48 (the Sibyl), Tib. 2.5.65–6 *haec cecinit vates et te sibi, Phoebe, vocavit,/iactavit fusa sed caput ante coma* (the Sibyl), Sen. *Oed.* 230, V. Fl. 1.207ff. This is accompanied by behaviour which can only be described as fierce (*torva* (504)) and insane (*non sano . . . pede* (506)); cf. e.g. *Met.* 2.640 (Ocyrhoe), Lyc. *Alex.* 5–7 (Cassandra), Verg. *A.* 6.49 *rabie fera corda,* 78 *bacchatur* (the Sibyl).

503 puppem stetit ante: the taking up of a position by the stern often marks someone out as the captain of a particular ship (cf. e.g. *Met.* 11.464, Verg. *A.* 8.115, 8.680). But in this instance, Carmentis' position by the stern is almost iconic, symbolising her role as the dominant guiding force behind the voyage; cf. e.g. *Met.* 15.698 (Aesculapius guides ship to Rome), Prop. 4.6.27–29 *cum Phoebus linquens stantem se vindice Delon/ . . . astitit Augusti puppim super* (Apollo leads Augustus' victory at Actium). Her position also helps to anticipate the forthcoming prophecy (509ff.), as the stern is a traditional platform from which important utterances are made; cf. e.g. Ap. Rhod. 4.1596 (Jason), Verg. *A.* 3.527 (Anchises), 5.12 (Palinurus), 5.841 (Sleep). For the (rare) postponement of *ante,* cf. 6.211 *muneris est tempus qui Nonas Lucifer ante est,* Lucr. 3.67, Stat. *Theb.* 12.140; J. Marouzeau (1947), "Place de la préposition", *REL* 25, 315.

506 pinea . . . texta: Ovidian metonymy for a ship; cf. *Met.* 14.530–1 *fert, ecce, avidas in pinea Turnus/texta faces* (Aeneas' ships), *Tr.* 1.4.9 (Ovid's own ship to exile); cf. also Prop. 4.6.19–20 *moles pinea* (Augustus' ship). It is an elevated phrase which finds precedent at Cat. 64.10—*pinea coniungens inflexae texta carinae*—where it helps recall the tradition that the first ship (the Argo) was constructed from a pine tree; see also 519n.

ter: odd numbers are considered propitious by the Romans, and the number three in particular is thought to be of good omen and is used in magic charms; for good omen, cf. e.g. 3.369 *ter tonuit sine nube deus, tria fulgura misit* (propitious sign from Jupiter), *Met.* 10.279; for usage in charms, cf. e.g. 6.753, *Met.* 7.153, Verg. *Ecl.* 8.73–5, Tib. 1.2.56, Tupet (1976) 46–7. It gives a mystical air to Carmentis' obscure antics in 505–6, by which she is either forewarning favourable

outcome for her and her son, or attempting to secure it by ritual.

507–8 neve daret . . . retenta manu "and so that she might not jump overboard in her haste to set foot on land, she was held back with difficulty—difficulty indeed—by Evander's hand": the clause introduced in 507 cannot be a virtually negative prohibition after *vix*—cf. Frazer, "Hardly, yea hardly did Evander hold her back from leaping in her haste to land"—as this would require *quin* rather than *neve*; see K.-St. II.2.256ff. It is most likely a final clause, though *neve* is usually reserved for introducing a second negative clause; see K.-St. II.2.210ff.

507 daret saltum: a periphrastic alternative to *salio*, finding precedent at Verg. *A.* 12.681, which is a favourite idiom of Ovid's; cf. *Met.* 3.599, 683, 4.552, 11.524, *Ib.* 283. Such idioms in which *do* is used in the sense of *facio* are distinctly poetic (see *Thes.* 5.1.1686.33ff.), and widely employed by our poet; for a list of such idioms by Ovid, see Bömer on *Met.* 2.165.

508 vix . . . vixque: the intensive gemination of *vix*, which emphasises the uncontrollable state of the frenzied prophetess, is not found before Ovid; cf. *Epic. Drusi* 167 *quin etiam corpus matri vix vixque remissum*, H.-Sz. 808ff., Wills (1996) 117–18.

509–14 The prophetess initially hails the land and its gods (509), its rivers, woods and Nymphs (511–12), before calling on good fortune for both herself and her son in this strange land (513–14). Such an address is categorised as an *epibaterion* (the speech of an arriver), which can take many different forms depending on the nature of the land visited and the reason for the visit; for the motif in general; cf. Men. Rh. 378ff., Appel (1909) 111–12; F. Cairns (1972), *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry*, Edinburgh, 18ff. In this instance, the *epibaterion* is conducted by an exile rejoicing his arrival in a new land; cf. *Met.* 1.318–21 (Deucalion and Pyrrha), 3.24–5 (Cadmus at Boeotia), Verg. *A.* 7.121ff. (Aeneas at Latium); also Hom. *Od.* 13.356ff. (Odysseus' return to Ithaca). There is particularly close allusion to the Vergilian passage (see nn.), reinforcing the influence of *Aeneid* in this section; see 469–542 (i) n.

509–10 The general nature of the opening here, with its reference to the land (*terra*) and its gods (*di*), is reminiscent of Aeneas on arrival at Latium; cf. Verg. *A.* 7.120–1 *salve fatis mihi debita tellus/ vosque . . . o fidi Troiae salvete penates.*

509 'di'que: *-que* is connected to *di*, even though *di* is part of direct speech uttered by Carmentis, whereas *-que* is part of the Ovidian

narrative with *dixit* ('and she said'). This transferal of *-que* is very common in and practically exclusive to Ovid; cf. e.g. 2.159, 4.263–4 *consulitur Paean, 'divum' que 'arcessite Matrem'/inquit*, 838, 848, 5.394, *Am.* 1.1.23–4 with McKeown ad loc., *Ars* 3.697, *Met.* 2.33, 5.290, 8.203, 9.109 with Bömer ad loc.

salvete: the verb is the standard Roman means of invoking a deity. Here it governs entities both animate (gods, Nymphs) and inanimate (the land, rivers, woods), which is quite usual; for its usage with gods, cf. *Met.* 2.428 (fake Diana), Verg. *A.* 8.301 *salve, vera Iovis proles*, Prop. 4.9.71, Appel (1909) 109–10; with humans, cf. e.g. Liv. 1.7.10 (Hercules), Verg. *A.* 5.80 (Anchises), 11.97 (Pallas); with inanimate entities, cf. e.g. Cat. 31.12 (the land Sirmio), Hor. *Carm.* 1.32.15 (Lyre). Its usage here, together with the ponderous genitive plurals (*petitorum . . . locorum*), create a suitably solemn tone.

510 novos caelo terra datura deos "the land destined to give new gods to the sky": Carmentis alludes to the deified individuals that will emerge from Rome, the most famous of whom, acknowledged elsewhere by Ovid, are Hercules (583–4, *Met.* 9.271–2), Aeneas (*Met.* 14.600ff.), Romulus (2.491ff., *Met.* 14.805ff.), Julius Caesar (*Met.* 15.746ff.) and Augustus (*Met.* 15.807ff.). To this familiar list Ovid will later seek to add Augustus' wife, Livia (cf. 535–6).

511–12 Carmentis proceeds to praise more specific features of the new land: rivers (*flumina*), fountains (*fontes*), trees (*silvae*) and indigenous Nymphs (*Naiadum*). This follows the standard practice of the *epibaterion*, which seeks to highlight redeeming geographical or divine features of a new land; cf. *Met.* 3.24–5 *Cadmus agit grates peregrinaeque oscula terrae/figit et ignotos montes agrosque salutat*, Verg. *A.* 7.136ff. *geniumque loci primamque deorum/Tellurem Nymphasque et adhuc ignota precatur/flumina . . . Idaeumque*, 8.71ff., Men. Rh. 382.

511 hospita tellus: *hospita* used adjectivally with *tellus* or *terra* is a common (epic) way of referring to the land at which wandering strangers are received; cf. *Met.* 3.637, Liv. 1.1.6, Verg. *A.* 3.539 *bellum, o terra hospita, portas* (Anchises), Tib. 2.5.42, Luc. 3.43, *Thes.* 6.3.3032.43ff.; see also 340n. (*hospita navis*).

512 nemorum silvae: for *silvae* in the sense 'trees', cf. e.g. Lucr. 5.1284, Verg. *G.* 2.26, Prop. 1.14.5, *Culex* 381–2 *tu cole fontes/et viridis nemorum silvas et pascua laetus*, Sen. *Oed.* 543, Stat. *Theb.* 2.248.

513 este bonis avibus "may you be a source of good omens": *bonis avibus* is predicative dative with *este*. Since omens were regularly taken from birds, *avis* and *ales* become popular poetic metonyms

for *omen*; cf. e.g. *Met.* 5.147, 6.433–4, 15.640 *ite bonis avibus prolemque accersite nostram* (Apollo to the Senate), Cat. 61.19–20 *bona cum bona/nubet alite virgo*, Hor. *Carm.* 1.15.5, Prop. 4.1.40, *Thes.* 2.1437.39ff.

514 ripaque felici tacta sit ista pede "let that bank be touched with the lucky foot": Carmentis means that the right foot should be put to land first, as it is considered lucky; cf. Eur. *Bacch.* 943, Vitr. 3.4.4, Petr. 30, Sil. 7.171–2 *attulit hospitio pergentem ad litora Calpes/ extremumque diem pes dexter et hora Lyaeum*; for the left foot as ill-omened, cf. *Ib.* 99 *ominibusque malis pedibusque occurrite laevis* (curse on Ibis), Apul. *Met.* 1.5.

515–36 The First Prophecy of Rome

Carmentis now embarks on a prophecy of Rome. She starts by predicting in general terms the worldwide power that Rome will acquire from humble beginnings (515–18). She then elaborates on two periods of Rome's future. First, she predicts the arrival into Italy and subsequent toils of Aeneas, under whose leadership conquered Troy will rise again (519–28). She then shifts abruptly to Ovid's own era, predicting the glory of the house of Augustus which culminates in the apotheosis of Julia Augusta (529–36).

i. *Sources and Inspiration*

Nowhere else in extant literature does Carmentis utter such an elaborate prophecy. That said, she is certainly reputed to have been the first to predict the glory of Rome, and is regarded as an individual of no less authority than the Sibyl; cf. Liv. 1.7.8 *Carmentae . . . quam fatiloquam ante Sibyllae in Italiam adventum miratae eae gentes fuerant*, Verg. *A.* 8.339–41 *Carmentis . . . /vatis fatidicae, cecinit quae prima futuros/Aeneadas magnos et nobile Pallanteum.*

Prophecies concerning the future success of Rome are popular in Augustan literature, where they represent an elaboration on earlier, vague indications of Rome's future prowess made by, for example, Cassandra at Lyc. *Alex.* 1270ff.; cf. *Met.* 15.439–49 (Pythagoras and Helenus), Verg. *A.* 1.257–96 (Jupiter), 6.83–97 (the Sibyl), 756ff. (Anchises), 8.626–728 (shield of Aeneas), Prop. 4.1.53–4, 87–8 (Cassandra), Tib. 2.5.39ff. (the Sibyl). More specifically, the culmi-

nation of Carmentis' prophecy with the house of Augustus (529–36) points directly to the Vergilian models, especially the prophecies of Jupiter (Verg. *A.* 1.257–96) and Anchises (Verg. *A.* 6.756–886). In both these cases, ending the prophecy with the rule of Augustus serves a panegyric purpose. First, it serves to encourage a sense of continuity between Rome's mythical origins and the Augustan era, something which the Emperor himself was eager to promote in an effort to shift focus away from the turbulent final years of the Republic. Moreover, it establishes Augustus himself as the very pinnacle of this progression, under whose rule the Golden Age will return (Verg. *A.* 6.791ff.) and wars will cease (Verg. *A.* 1.291). Ovid is fully aware of the political dimension of this motif, as he moves the climax on by one generation: Ovid has Carmentis culminate the prophecy beyond Augustus to the foreseeable deification of his wife Livia (see below). Despite this change, Ovid is still keen to forge a flattering sense of continuity between Rome's present establishment and its mythical past (see 527–8n.)

ii. *Revision of the Text*

It is beyond reasonable doubt that Ovid revised part of the text of 515–36 in his last years of exile. This is evidenced by the fact that he refers to Livia in 536 as 'Iulia Augusta', a title that she only received after Augustus' death in A.D. 14 (see below). Beyond this detail, however, there is considerable speculation as to how much of the text of 515–36 has been revised.

Some suggest that only the lines concerning the post-Augustan dynasty (533–6) are revised; see Frazer on 533, Bömer on 533–6. Others suggest that the original prophecy might have ended at 529–30, which makes a fitting climax; see Le Bonniec on 531, Fantham (1985) 261. More recently, however, it has been argued that there is an underlying coherence to the entire section on the Carmentalia which suggests a complete revision of this section from exile. Throughout the episode, the focus on the dominant guiding force of the mother Carmentis over her hesitant, inexperienced son is, it is suggested, directly analogous to the maternal dynastic superiority of Livia over Tiberius; the intended connection is only intensified in the final lines of the prophecy (535–6), when Carmentis openly likens herself to Livia; for the argument, see Herbert-Brown (1994)

160ff. This suggestion is interesting but pushes the issue too far. A correlation between Carmentis/Livia and Evander/Tiberius might be made *with hindsight* when the reader reaches 535–6, but it is not one which is imposed upon the reader throughout the section. It is better to explain Carmentis' dominant position in the story in terms of the fact that Ovid is specifically celebrating *her* place in the calendar; see 469–542 (i) n.

iii. *Livia*

Whatever the extent of the revision in 515–36, it is clear that the prophecy ultimately looks towards and gives pride of place to Livia. Livia Drusilla, the long-time wife of Augustus and mother of Tiberius, is largely absent from Augustan literature: her only (unnamed) appearance before Ovid is at Hor. *Carm.* 3.14.5–6, where she is one of a number of people celebrating Augustus' return to Rome. Livia does, however, constitute an important character in *Fasti*, as she is invoked four times in her own right: cf. 1.536, 649–50, 5.157–8, 6.637–8. It has been persuasively argued by Herbert-Brown [(1994) 130–72] that these entries show a change in image for Livia from the pre-exilic Books of the poem (5 and 6) to the post-exilic Book 1. In the entries in Books 5 and 6, Livia is portrayed as a chaste spouse, subordinate to her husband Augustus and promoting his aims; for Ovid's take on the chastity of Livia, see also 650n. By the time of the revised Book 1, however, the image of Livia has been flatteringly enlarged such that she has become goddess-in-waiting (536), comparable to both Juno and Venus (649–50nn.).

This enlargement in the image of Livia is directly linked to Ovid's new status as exile. It appears from his exile poetry that Ovid sees Livia as a very powerful mediator between himself and the present Emperor, one who may be able to secure his return; cf. *Pont.* 2.8.43–4 (prayer to Livia for support for a suppliant), 3.1.113ff. esp. 114 *Caesaris est coniunx ore precanda tuo* (instructions to his wife). His reference to Livia specifically as Iulia Augusta (536) demonstrates his awareness of the increasing power that Livia was acquiring. The title, which officially adopted Livia into the Julian family, was conferred on her in accordance with Augustus' will in A.D. 14. As there was no Roman precedent for a male title conferred on a woman, and because Augustus left no specific instructions as to its significance,

there was much debate as to whether the title was intended to be purely honorary or one which carried with it formal constitutional power. Both the Senate and Livia believed it to be the latter. The Senate formally proposed that Livia be hailed as *mater patriae,* and that Tiberius be referred to as *Iuliae filius*; cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.14, Suet. *Tib.* 50.2–3, Dio 57.12.4. Livia herself believed that she was entitled to constitutional power which was at least equal to her son's (cf. Tac. *Ann.* 4.57, Suet. *Tib.* 50.2, Dio 57.12.3–4); for full discussion of the issue, see Flory (1998), Barrett (2002) 148–58.

In the event, the new Emperor Tiberius vetoed many of the powers proposed for his mother. For our purposes, however, it is clear to see why Ovid may have revised this section after the death of Augustus: along with Germanicus, Livia might prove a powerful ally for the poet in his bid to return from exile; flattering references to the Emperor's mother, acknowledging her new status, might, therefore, bring personal benefits.

515 fallor, an: for the expression, cf. 2.853 *fallimur, an veris praenuntia venit hirundo,* 5.549, *Am.* 1.6.49, 3.1.34, *Met.* 13.641, *Tr.* 1.2.107, *Pont.* 2.8.21, *Ciris* 227–8, *Thes.* 6.1.184.14ff. This type of expression often acts (as here) as a way of insisting on the truth of what follows. The implication is that, despite the incredible circumstance, the speaker is not being deceived; see Brink on Hor. *Ars* 42. *fallor, an* is a fitting start to the prophecy for other reasons. First, it serves to create an appropriate sense of awe, as the prophetess herself cannot quite believe the extent of Rome's rise from humble beginnings. Furthermore, it helps to mark the first stage of her prophetic vision: unsure at first, she soon becomes confident in the events she relates.

hi fient ingentia moenia colles: *moenia* could be translated literally as 'walls' or as synecdoche, 'city'; for the latter sense, cf. e.g. 2.481, 710, 3.560, 6.377, Verg. *A.* 2.252, 4.96, Prop. 4.1.57 *moenia namque pio coner disponere versu,* *Thes.* 8.1327.59ff. Either way, a contrast is being made between the city/site of Rome in its humble, rural days and its wealthy modern day counterpart; see also 193–226n. For the specific sentiment here—city replacing hills—cf. Tib. 2.5.23–6, Prop. 4.1.1–2 *hoc quodcumque vides . . . qua maxima Roma est/ante Phrygem Aenean collis et herba fuit.*

516 iuraque ab hac terra cetera terra petet? "and will it be from this land that all other lands seek their laws?": the juxtaposition of *ab hac terra* and *cetera terra* is a neat way of conveying the

popular conceit that Rome was giver of laws to the entire world; cf. Verg. *A.* 4.231 *ac totum sub leges mitteret orbem* (Jupiter's instructions to Aeneas) with Pease ad loc., 6.851, Hor. *Carm.* 3.3.43ff., Prop. 4.4.11, Man. 3.24–5.

517 montibus his olim totus promittitur orbis: this alludes to the popular conceit that the world belonged to Rome, a conceit often expressed by highlighting the connection between *Urbs* and *orbis*; see 85–6n.

olim: in the future sense 'one day'; cf. e.g. 535, *Am.* 3.11.7 *dolor hic tibi proderit olim*, Verg. *G.* 2.190, *A.* 1.20, Hor. *S.* 1.4.137, *Thes.* 9.2.559.63ff.

518 tantum fati . . . habere locum "how great a destiny this place possesses": for similar phraseology, cf. 2.408 *heu quantum fati parva tabella tulit* (vessel carrying the infants Romulus and Remus).

519 Dardaniae . . . pinus alludes to the arrival of Aeneas into Italy. Dardanus was the traditional founder of Dardania, a city which was later replaced by Troy; cf. Hom. *Il.* 20.215ff., Apollod. 3.12.1. *Dardanius* is therefore used as a learned epithet for 'Trojan' (cf. e.g. *Met.* 13.335, 15.431, 767, Enn. fr. *Ann.* 344 Sk., Cat. 64.367, Verg. *A.* 3.596), and its usage to refer specifically to Aeneas' ships is popular; cf. *Rem.* 58 *Dardanias . . . rates*, Verg. *A.* 4.657–8 *si litora tantum/numquam Dardaniae tetigissent nostra carinae* (Dido), Prop. 4.1.40. *pinus* is poetic metonymy for 'ship', recalling the tradition that the first ship was made of pine; cf. 506 with n., Verg. *A.* 10.206, Hor. *Epod.* 16.57, Bömer on *Met.* 2.185.

520 hic quoque causa novi femina Martis erit "here too, a woman will be the cause of fresh warfare": Carmentis suggests that, just as the abduction of Helen set the Trojan War in motion, so the promised marriage of Lavinia to Aeneas, rather than Turnus, will cause war between the Trojans and Latins. Her words recall Vergil's Sibyl, who expresses a similar sentiment to Aeneas so as to provide a link between his former and forthcoming wars; cf. Verg. *A.* 6.93–4 *causa mali tanti coniunx iterum hospita Teucris/externique iterum thalami*. More generally, this over-simplistic interpretation of the war in Latium is one frequently adopted by Ovid, where it follows the conceit that women were the principal cause of war; cf. 4.879–80, *Am.* 2.12.21–2 *femina Troianos iterum nova bella movere/impulit in regno, iuste Latine, tuo*, *Met.* 14.450–1, Hes. *Op.* 164–5, Hdt. 1.1ff. (conflicts between Greeks and foreigners 'caused' by women).

521–2 Carmentis' utterance here recalls the latter part of Vergil's *Aeneid*. Pallas, the son of Evander, goes out to fight for the Trojan

side and is slain by Turnus. Aeneas later kills Turnus, justifying it specifically in terms of vengeance for the death of Pallas; for the death of Pallas, cf. Verg. *A.* 10.474ff.; for Aeneas' vengeance, cf. Verg. *A.* 12.919ff. esp. 948–9 *Pallas te hoc vulnere, Pallas/immolat et poenam scelerato ex sanguine sumit* (Aeneas to Turnus).

Pallas does not appear in any other prophecy of Rome, but his inclusion here seems natural given the identity of the prophetess. In relating the fate of Rome, it is understandable—though, one might feel, unfortunate in an uplifting speech to Pallas' father—that Carmentis should offer some reaction to the tragic fate of Pallas, who will be her grandson. There is, however, a notable difference in register between these two lines. In 521, Carmentis takes a short time out to focus on the scene of her grandson's donning arms, just as it occurs in her vision: note the present tense *induis* compared to the future tenses used elsewhere in the prophecy (524n.). *care* sets the personal, empathetic tone in this line, and *funesta . . . arma* 'death-bringing arms', an unparalleled phrase (*Thes.* 6.1.1585.3), is dramatically ironic given that it is the *bearer* who will be killed. But this proves only to be a momentary emotional outburst, as Carmentis reverts back to the detached mode of prophecy in the next line: *indue* (emphatic repetition of *induis*) marks a change in Carmentis' position as she recognises that the status of Pallas' avenger, a man who will found the Roman settlement, is more important to the future of Rome than the life of her grandson.

Though there are no specific allusions, this apostrophe, made to someone not yet born but destined to die tragically, might remind the reader of the famous lament for Augustus' nephew, the younger M. Claudius Marcellus, in Anchises' prophecy at Verg. *A.* 6.868ff.

522 non humili vindice caesus eris "your death will be avenged by no lowly champion": Carmentis alludes to Aeneas' vengeance on Turnus for the death of Pallas. The general sentiment here, that consolation in death can be drawn from the nobility of the avenger, appears to be an extension of a motif which belongs to the male heroic code, namely that a dying warrior might be consoled by the status of his conqueror; cf. *Met.* 5.190–2 (Nileus to Perseus), 9.5–7 (Achelous about Hercules), 12.80–1 (Achilles to youth), Verg. *A.* 10.829–30 *hoc tamen infelix miseram solabere mortem:/Aeneae magni dextra cadis* (Aeneas to Lausus), 11.688–9 (Camilla to Ornytus). That Carmentis should propose such a consolation to her own grandson shows that we are firmly back to the detached 'nationalistic' mode of prophecy; see 521–2n.

523–4 That the vanquished Troy would rise again in the form of Rome was a popular conceit among the poets; cf. *Rem.* 281, *Met.* 15.439ff., Verg. *A.* 1.206, Prop. 4.1.47, 87 *Troia cades, et Troica Roma resurges*, Man. 4.30–1, Edwards (1996) 63ff. Carmentis lays considerable emphasis on the reversal of fortune ('the vanquished as victors'): three times, between *victa/vinces*, *eversa/resurges* and the etymologically related *obruet/ruina.*

523 victa . . . vinces: the juxtaposition of active and passive forms of the same verb, effectively expressing role reversal, is a particular favourite of Ovid's; cf. e.g. *Her.* 7.61, *Met.* 8.459, 14.81, Wills (1996) 248–50.

524 obruet hostiles ista ruina domos "the very ruins will reduce to ruins the enemy homes": Carmentis means that, from Troy's ruins will spring Rome, which will eventually destroy the enemy Greeks in the early second century B.C. Given the Greeks' victory at Troy, the enemy's comeuppance is a satisfying landmark in Roman history which is highlighted previously in Jupiter's prophecy; cf. Verg. *A.* 1.283–5 *veniet lustris labentibus aetas/cum domus Assaraci . . . victis dominabitur Argis.* The MSS are divided between *obruet* (**Uζω**) and *obruit* (**Aς**). *obruet* is preferable on the grounds that the prophecy is conducted predominantly in the future tense, but for one (unquestionable) use of the present tense which is reserved for a special personal interjection (see 521–2n.).

525 victrices . . . flammae: for the metaphorical usage of *victrix*, cf. e.g. *Met.* 10.151 (*fulmina*), Cic. *Tusc.* 2.21 (*manus*), Verg. *A.* 3.54 (*arma*), Luc. 1.347 (*signa*).

Neptunia Pergama: the walls of Troy were traditionally constructed by Neptune. He was working for the king Laomedon, who tried to cheat his divine worker of his wages; for the story, cf. Hom. *Il.* 21.441ff., Apollod. 2.5.9. Following this tradition, poets refer to the walls of Troy as 'Neptunian'; cf. Cat. 64.367 *urbis Dardaniae Neptunia solvere vincla*, Prop. 3.9.41. Vergil is the first to extend this motif to suggest that Troy itself is 'Neptunian' (cf. Verg. *A.* 2.625, 3.3), and Ovid continues this idea here (cf. also *Her.* 3.151–2). If anything, Ovid's expression is even more allusive: Pergama is strictly speaking the citadel of Troy (cf. Hom. *Il.* 4.508, Verg. *A.* 3.87), but it becomes a popular metonym for Troy itself (cf. e.g. *Met.* 12.445, Lucr. 1.476, Verg. *A.* 1.651).

526 num minus hic toto est altior orbe cinis? "Is this ash then, to any less degree, higher than the entire world?": Carmentis

expresses Rome's rise to world domination from the ruins of Troy in the metaphorical terms of Troy's ashes (*cinis*), thus creating a contrast between naturally low-lying ash and the ash, symbolic of the new city, which will proverbially rise to the stars. This is Carmentis' last comment concerning the stark change of fortune from Troy to Rome (cf. 515–18, 523–4) and it is undoubtedly the most striking and contrived image. It may well have been inspired by Cassandra's prophecy at Prop. 4.1.53–4, where the prophetess likewise draws attention to the powerful nature of the seemingly harmless ash of Troy: *vertite equum, Danai! male vincitis! Ilia tellus/vivet, et huic cineri Iuppiter arma dabit*; cf. also Man. 1.511–12 *Troianos cineres in quantum oblita refovit/imperium. num minus* (**M**(?)ς) is preferable to *non minus* (**Uh**ς) on the grounds that the idiom is used elsewhere by Ovid to give a negative force to a rhetorical question; cf. 3.5–6 *ipse vides manibus peragi fera bella Minervae:/num minus ingenuis artibus illa vacat?*, *Her.* 11.21, 17.232, 18.174.

527–8 iam pius Aeneas sacra et, sacra altera, patrem/adferet "Now dutiful Aeneas will carry the sacred items and a second sacred item, his father": the verb *adferet* can be taken in two ways here. First, it can be translated in the strict sense 'bring to'; the implication would be that Aeneas will bring Anchises *to* Italy. Ovid may be alluding to a popular tradition of the Aeneas myth which sees Anchises reach Italy; cf. Str. 5.3.2, Dion. Hal. 1.64.5, Serv. *A.* 1.267, 570, 3.711, 4.427 (mentioning Cato's *Origines* as a source). The potential problem with this is that, according to the Vergilian tradition, to which Ovid elsewhere adheres, Anchises never reaches Italy, but dies earlier at the port of Drepanum in Sicily; cf. Verg. *A.* 3.707–10, Ov. *Met.* 14.83–4. In view of this, it may be more appropriate to translate *adferet* in the looser sense 'bring, carry'. Lines 527–8 would therefore evoke the iconic image of the hero carrying the sacred items and his father away from Troy, a paradigm of piety in Augustan Rome which is regularly represented in art, coinage and literature; cf. 5.563, *Her.* 7.79–80, Verg. *A.* 2.707ff., Prop. 4.1.43–4, Tib. 2.5.19–20 *haec dedit Aeneae sortes, postquam ille parentem/dicitur et raptos sustinuisse Lares* with Smith ad loc., Zanker (1988) 201ff.

The phraseology here is sophisticated, with *sacra* used at one time to refer to the sacred items brought from Troy (the Penates), and at another in apposition with *patrem*, to refer to something sacred in a personal way. This type of phrase articulation is a favourite of Ovid's, particularly in descriptions of Aeneas; cf. 4.37–8 *hinc satus*

Aeneas . . . / sacra patremque umeris, altera sacra, tulit, Met. 13.624–5 *sacra et, sacra altera, patrem/fert umeris . . . Cythereius heros*; cf. also *Met.* 7.156–7 *heros Aesonius . . . spolioque superbus/muneris auctorem secum, spolia altera, portans* (Jason with two spoils, the fleece and Medea).

However we interpret the line, it is important to notice that the action described in 527–8 is chronologically out of sequence with the rest of the prophecy: if we understand 527–8 to refer to Aeneas leaving Troy, it ought strictly to have been placed before 519–20; if we understand 527–8 to refer to Aeneas arriving in Italy, it could be placed before 521–2. Saving the sentiment until this point serves two important structural roles. First, in the immediate context, it helps to bridge the forthcoming abrupt temporal shift from the time of Aeneas to that of Julius Caesar/Augustus (529ff.). In 527–8 we learn that Aeneas will bring *sacra* to Italy, and there is an appeal to Vesta for their protection. In 529–30 we look ahead in time to a successful outcome to this appeal, in that Julius Caesar/Augustus are indeed preserving and conducting *sacra* (530). Secondly, in the context of the entire prophecy, the presence of the sentiment here provides a neat thematic link between the duties of Aeneas and the present Emperor. In 527–8, Aeneas' duty is to carry his father. In 533–4, the duty of Augustus/Tiberius in taking control of the Empire is explained in a manner which cleverly alludes to this image: they both have the duty of carrying 'the weight of their father' (*pondera . . . paterna feret* (534)). The iconic image of Aeneas in 527–8, therefore, has been moved out of its chronological context so that a more effective correlation and sense of continuity can be made between imperial family and mythical past. Ovid is perhaps adopting a technique from Vergil, who also manipulates the chronology of prophecy for this end. During the prophecy of Rome at *A.* 6.756ff., the anachronistic juxtaposition of Aeneas and Romulus with Julius Caesar and Augustus—the intervening history is mentioned later in the prophecy—is often explained in terms of Vergil's desire to emphasise correlation and continuity between Aeneas, Romulus and the contemporary rulers; see G. Williams (1983), *Technique and Ideas in the Aeneid*, Yale, 144ff.; F. Cairns (1989), *Virgil's Augustan Epic*, Cambridge, 60f.

527 pius: Ovid adopts for Aeneas the archetypal epithet/quality found in Vergil; cf. 2.543 *Aeneas, pietatis idoneus auctor*, 546, 3.601, 4.37, 274, 799; for the piety of Aeneas in general, see Pease on Verg. *A.* 4.393.

528 Iliacos accipe, Vesta, deos: by the 'gods of Ilium', Ovid

probably includes both the Penates and the Palladium (the image of Pallas Athene), both of which were rescued from Troy by Aeneas and subsequently housed in one of the temples of Vesta in Rome; cf. *Tr.* 3.1.29, Dion. Hal. 2.66, Tac. *Ann.* 15.41; for the problems surrounding the existence of certain temples of Vesta, see Herbert-Brown (1994) 74–9, Steinby V.125–9.

529 tempus erit cum: formulae of this type are common in Ovid; cf. *Med.* 47, *Ars* 1.213 *ergo erit illa dies, qua,* 3.69 *tempus erit, quo, Met.* 3.519, *Tr.* 4.2.73; for this particular collocation, cf. Tib. 1.4.79–80 *tempus erit, cum me Veneris praecepta ferentem/deducat iuvenum sedula turba senem* (Priapus), Stat. *Theb.* 1.32. As in our example, such phrases often form part of solemn prophetic diction; cf. e.g. *Met.* 3.519 (Tiresias to Pentheus), Verg. *A.* 1.283 *veniet... aetas* (Jupiter), 10.11 *adveniet... tempus* (Jupiter), Headlam on Herod. 4.50.

530 et fient ipso sacra colente deo "and the sacred rites will be made, with a god himself worshipping": the general nature of this statement allows for two different candidates for *deo,* namely Julius Caesar and Augustus. Both had charge of sacred rites when they achieved the position of Pontifex Maximus, Caesar from 63 B.C. onwards (cf. Suet. *Iul.* 13) and Augustus from 6th March, A.D. 12 (cf. *Fasti Praenestini* (Degrassi 121), Frazer on 3.419). Both were also recognised by the poet as deified individuals; see 510n.

The choice of candidate here creates a sense of fluidity from one generation of the Julian family to the next, and is typical of the imprecise way in which Ovid eulogises the imperial family in the poem; see also 533n., 593–616n., 599–600n., 608n.

531 et penes Augustos patriae tutela manebit "and the guardianship of the land will remain in the power of the house of Augustus": *Thes.* 2.1384.81ff. suggests that this is the first occurrence of the plural of *Augustus* in the sense 'the emperor successors of Augustus'; cf. e.g. Sen. *Clem.* 1.14.2, Serv. *A.* 6.760. However, given that Carmentis includes Livia within this category (536), it is more appropriate to take the adjective in the sense 'those of (the house of) Augustus'. Either way, the time evoked is that after the death of Augustus in A.D. 14; on the question of revision in these lines, see 515–36 (ii) n.

The solemnity of the sentiment is enhanced by the use of the grand terms *tutela* (see 415n.) and *penes,* a preposition which is usually reserved for the most powerful individuals, particularly the gods; cf. 119 (Janus), Pl. *Poen.* 1187–8 (Jupiter), Prop. 3.7.57 *di maris Aegaei*

quos sunt penes aequora, Verg. *A.* 12.59 (Turnus), Liv. 23.23.4, Fest. 22 L., McKeown on *Am.* 2.2.1.

532 hanc . . . domum: the concept of the *domus Augusta*—of which Ovid is the first to make public acknowledgment—may have only come into existence after the adoption of Tiberius; cf. 701, 6.810, *Pont.* 2.2.74 *ceteraque Augustae membra valere domus*, 3.1.135, *Thes.* 5.1.1983.70ff., Fantham (1985) 260ff.

fas is stronger than 'right/necessary' and closer to 'ordained (by divine will)'; cf. e.g. Cic. *Phil.* 6.19, Verg. *A.* 1.206 *illic fas regna resurgere Troiae* (Aeneas to comrades), 7.692, Liv. 9.9.14, *Thes.* 6.1.293.56ff.

imperii frena tenere: the Roman statesman is here represented as the charioteer in charge of his horses' reins; for the 'chariot-of-state' metaphor, cf. *Pont.* 2.9.33 *Caesar ut imperii moderetur frena precamur*, 4.13.27–8, *Tr.* 2.42, Cic. *Rep.* 2.68, Luc. 1.316, Sil. 8.279–83, Claud. *Stil.* 3.9–10.

533 nepos natusque dei: two translations are possible. *deus* could be taken as Julius Caesar, and *natus* and *nepos* as two separate individuals, respectively Augustus, adopted son of Julius Caesar in his will, and Tiberius, adopted son of Augustus in A.D. 4, and hence grandson of Julius Caesar. A suitable translation would be "the god's son and grandson" (Frazer). Alternatively, *deus* could be taken in a general sense, and *natus* and *nepos* as referring to the same individual, namely Tiberius, who was adopted grandson of the deified Caesar and adopted son of the deified Augustus. One would therefore translate 'the grandson and son of a god'. Given that both Augustus and Tiberius famously refuse power (see below) and take on their father's burden of ruling, either (and both) renderings are acceptable; see also 530n.

licet ipse recuset: it is famously related that both Augustus and Tiberius often refused titles and positions of power. Augustus informs us of such refusals in his *Res Gestae*; cf. 4, 5 *Dictaturam . . . non accepi*, 6, 10, 21; cf. also Dio 53.2–10, Suet. *Aug.* 58. Tiberius later displays the same reluctance, which seems to have been regarded as a sincere gesture of humility by Vell. 2.124, but, more popularly, as a farcical ploy by a cunning man, who was contriving to compel the Senate to thrust the dignity upon him; cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.11ff., Suet. *Tib.* 24.

534 pondera caelesti mente paterna feret: empire is often (flatteringly) regarded as a burden which must be borne by a worthy individual; cf. e.g. 616, *Met.* 15.1–2, 819–20 *tu facies natusque suus . . . / inpositum feret unus onus*, *Pont.* 2.8.29ff., Calp. *Ecl.* 1.84, Tac.

Ann. 1.11. For the important implication of the phraseology here, see 527–8n. *caelesti mente*, 'heavenly mind', is a striking phrase which is unparalleled in the Augustan poets. Herbert-Brown suggests [(2002) 123 n.74] that this may be a subtle allusion to the Emperors' increasing reliance on astrology in the maintenance of power (for which, see Barton (1994) 33–47).

535–6 Carmentis concludes the prophecy by predicting the apotheosis of Augustus' wife, Livia. Whilst they were both alive, Tiberius seems to have refused divine honours for both himself and his mother (Suet. *Tib.* 26, Tac. *Ann.* 4.37–8); Livia is eventually deified much later, in A.D. 42, by her grandson Claudius (Suet. *Cl.* 11).

535 perpetuis . . . in aris "on permanent altars": the long-lasting shrine of Carmentis, situated between the Capitol and the Tiber, is discussed later by Ovid in his second entry on the Carmentalia; see 629n.

536 Augusta . . . Iulia: the name received by Livia, the wife of Augustus, in accordance with her husband's will; see 515–36 (iii) n.

537 talibus ut dictis nostros descendit in annos "When, with these words, she had come down into our own years": *descendo* is used here to denote chronological progression down to a particular point in time; cf. Var. *R.* 2.1.3 *necesse est humanae vitae a summa memoria gradatim descendisse ad hanc aetatem*, 2.1.5, Liv. 33.21.5, Man. 1.735, *Thes.* 5.1.651.18ff. The use of the verb in this context with *in* rather than *ad* is, however, rare; cf. Quint. *Inst.* 1.11.18: *cuius disciplinae usus in nostram usque aetatem sine reprehensione descendit.*

Unfamiliarity with this construction might account in part for the popularly-attested, though markedly different reading, *talibus auspiciis nostros descendit ad agros* (**Uζς**). This reading is acceptable in that it continues the theme of maternal supremacy—*she* is the first to land on Latin soil—and picks up the story just before the prophecy (507–8) where she had been very keen to set foot on land. That said, the resulting repetition of ideas with 539 (Evander setting foot on land) should encourage us to adopt the former reading.

538 in medio . . . sono: as the story of Rome can (of course) only be related down to the poet's own era, prophecy often ends abruptly. A convenient poetic way of accounting for this is to suggest that the prophecy could have continued but for the intervention of the Fates, who forbid excessive knowledge of the future; cf. e.g. *Met.* 2.655ff. *restabat fatis aliquid . . . 'praevertunt' inquit 'me fata, vetorque/plura loqui* (Ochyroe). The phrase *in medio . . . sono* suggests that

Carmentis breaks off mid-word, mid-sound—cf. *Met.* 5.192–3 *pars ultima vocis/in medio suppressa sono est* (Nileus)—and is as such an effective means of expressing the motif.

praescia lingua: *praescius*, 'foreknowing', is a common epithet for prophetic individuals; cf. 5.95 (Carmentis), *Met.* 6.157 (Manto), 9.418 (Themis), 13.162 (Thetis), Verg. *A.* 6.66 (Sibyl), Sen. *Ag.* 319 (Manto). However, the transferal of the epithet here from the prophetess to a specific part of her—i.e. *praescia lingua* instead of *lingua praesciae Carmentis*—is a predominantly poetic expression; cf. Verg. *A.* 12.452–3 *miseris, heu, praescia longe/horrescunt corda agricolis*, V. Fl. 5.528, *Thes.* 10.2.822.64ff.; for Ovid's tendency to transfer epithet from person to mouth, see 130n.

539 puppibus: a poetic plural (the singular is used in 503).

540 felix, exilium cui locus ille fuit! "O what a happy man was he, who had for exile *that* place!": some argue for a post-exilic reading here, suggesting that this is a personal comment from the poet himself who, clearly unhappy with his own place of exile (cf. e.g. *Tr.* 2.575–8, 4.4a.51, 5.2b.73–8, *Pont.* 1.3.83–4), hails the luck of Evander at being exiled in Italy; see Fränkel (1945) 227–8, Bömer on 540. Though this is possible, we should also note that it is an Ovidian tendency to end an exile's story with a statement of happiness; cf. *Met.* 3.131–2 *iam stabant Thebae: poteras iam, Cadme, videri/exilio felix* (Cadmus). Besides, such an authorial interjection praising Rome is entirely consistent with the nationalistic, laudatory tone of the episode.

felix . . . cui: for the formula, see 297n.

541 stabant nova tecta: Evander founds a city and calls it Pallanteum after Pallas, the author of his race; cf. Verg. *A.* 8.53–4 *posuere in montibus urbem/Pallantis proavi de nomine Pallanteum*; see also 469–542 (i) n.

541–2 nec alter/montibus Ausoniis Arcade maior erat: this could be taken as a comparison of mountains: 'nor was there any other mount in Italy greater than the Arcadian (i.e. Palatine)'; cf. 2.423 *quid vetat Arcadio dictos a monte Lupercos?* Alternatively, *Arcade* could refer to Evander, a recognised epithet for the hero; cf. e.g. 5.643 *Arcadis Euandri nomen tibi saepe refertur*, Tac. *Ann.* 11.14. This latter interpretation might also allow a better sense of progression to the forthcoming story of Hercules and Cacus (543ff.): just when we are told that Evander is greater than any other individual (*maior*), along comes Hercules, the greatest of men, a position mirrored by his foundation of the *Ara Maxima* ('the Greatest Altar'); for similar play between *maior* and *maximus*, see 603–6 with nn.

543–82 Hercules and Cacus

Ovid proceeds to narrate the arrival of Hercules to Evander's newly-founded territory and his subsequent confrontation with Cacus. Hercules, travelling with the cattle he won from Geryon, arrives at Evander's house and is warmly received (543–6). Whilst he is being entertained, the monstrous robber Cacus steals some of his unguarded cattle (547–58). On learning the whereabouts of his lost beasts, Hercules confronts the robber in a heated battle and eventually strikes him down (559–78). To commemorate the deed, Hercules sets up the Ara Maxima ('the Greatest Altar') at a place later known as the Forum Boarium (579–82).

i. *Sources and Development of the Myth*

The story of Hercules and Cacus is best known to us from the various Augustan age accounts; cf. Liv. 1.7.4ff., Verg. *A.* 8.185–275, Dion. Hal. 1.39–40, Prop. 4.9.1–20; for short, later versions, cf. [Aur. Vict.] *Orig.* 6–7, Fontenrose (1959) 339 n.28. That said, the basic elements of the story may go back to (at least) 2nd century B.C., as some later authors point to early historians; cf. [Aur. Vict.] *Orig.* 6–7 (Cassius Hemina [2nd century B.C.]), Solinus 1.7–10 (Gnaeus Gellius [2nd century B.C.]).

Regardless of exactly when the basic details of the myth were established, it is generally held that the story originally came about as a fusion of Greek and Etrusco-Roman myth. There had long been in Greek myth a series of encounters between Hercules and various bandits trying to steal his cattle; see Fontenrose (1959) 338–9, who counts at least twenty-one such encounters. Cacus (or Cacu), by contrast, seems originally to have been a local resident of the Palatine, though portrayals of him range from good to evil and from seer to thief; for the development of the Cacus myth, see Small (1982) 3–36.

ii. *The Impact of Vergil*

The myth of Hercules and Cacus undoubtedly sees its greatest transformation under Vergil. Occupying a pivotal position in *Aeneid* 8, Vergil's version of the myth, narrated by Evander, becomes deeply symbolic. First, the encounter is set on a superhuman plane, with

Cacus portrayed as a huge, fire-breathing monster (see 571–2n.), a fine match for Hercules. As such, we are invited to read the encounter as an epic struggle between good and evil, or even in Gigantomachic terms as a struggle between the Olympian order and the monster. Furthermore, within the context of *Aeneid*, the story seems to be designed to serve as a parable not only for Aeneas' own forthcoming struggle with Turnus, but ultimately also for Augustus' struggle against Antony at Actium, as enshrined on Aeneas' shield; for useful discussions of the symbolic overtones of the Vergilian myth, see Galinsky (1972) 142ff., Hardie (1986) 110–18, Morgan (1998) 175–7. In short, Vergil gives the myth new religious, moral and political dimensions which later writers can hardly ignore.

In light of this, it is surprising that Ovid's version of the myth has not been seriously examined in its own right. In fact, scholars have long tended to pass off Ovid's version as a light-hearted, low-key, typically 'elegiac' treatment; see Otis (1970) 31–6, Galinsky (1972) 153ff., Schubert (1992) 439–43; even Miller (2002) 189–92, who (rightly) draws attention to the creative nature of Ovid's elegiacs and the nexus of verbal echoes in the story, casts doubt on the 'seriousness' of the episode. Such analyses have the effect of downplaying the consciously Vergilian manner in which Ovid has chosen to relate the myth and, though some of the similarities in detail between Ovid and Vergil have been duly noticed—see F. Munzer (1911), *Cacus der Rinderdieb*, Basel; Schubert (1991), Merli (2000) 288–308—a more systematic investigation is required.

Similarities in Overall Design

We should be aware that the festival which celebrates the foundation of the Ara Maxima actually takes place on 12th August in the Roman year; cf. e.g. *Fasti Vallenses* (Degrassi 149), *Fasti Amiternini* (Degrassi 191). As such, the position of the story here in Book 1 is striking. By placing it just after his account of Evander's foundation of Pallanteum, Ovid demonstrates that he is more interested in constructing a chronological mythological narrative, along the lines of Verg. *A.* 8, than adhering strictly to calendar date.

Moreover, both poets have similar reasons to tell the story in the same way. Each author emphasises the monstrous aspects of Cacus and the larger-than-life combat scene in order to highlight the magnitude of Hercules. In Vergil, this serves to emphasise the greatness

of the salvation that the hero brings to the local region, and to justify the worship that Evander and his people are conducting; cf. Verg. *A.* 8.184ff. esp. 188–9 *saevis, hospes Troiane, periclis/servati facimus meritosque novamus honores.* In Ovid, it helps to justify Hercules' future deification as prophesied by Carmentis (583–4) and to make him a fitting candidate for one of the new gods which, the prophetess had foretold, would emerge from this land (510).

Similarities in Detail, Style and Register

Careful analysis of 543–82 suggests that Ovid's version of the Hercules and Cacus myth is very closely modelled on Vergil's in terms of individual detail. Furthermore, the story appears to be related in as grand a manner as possible in the context of the poem. Though the story in *Fasti* is not part of an ongoing, unified narrative as in *Aeneid*, Ovid's careful modelling of Vergil does nothing to affect adversely any complex religious, moral or political resonances the Vergilian version may have.

First, the density of hyperbole found in Vergil's myth is present in Ovid's version, which constantly keeps the episode on a larger-than-life plane; see 554n. Along with this, the Gigantomachic elements present in the Vergilian myth (see Hardie (1986) 110–18), which help raise the conflict on to a cosmic level as a fight between good and evil, are manifest in Ovid's version; see 555n., 557–8n., 563n., 564n., 567–8n., 573–4n. The grandeur of the episode is further enhanced by the diction employed, as there is a noticeably high density of innovative coinages and novel usages which make this the most philologically interesting part of Book 1; for potential coinages, see 543n., 546n., 561n., 566n., 569n., 575n.; for new meanings to existing words, see 545n., 547n., 560n., 563n. There is, furthermore, no convincing case for suggesting that the seriousness of the Ovidian episode is in any way compromised by the difference in metre between the two poems; see 551–8n.

Ovidian Differences

Despite the heavy debt to the story in *Aeneid* 8, there are a few interesting differences between this and Ovid's version. First, Ovid occasionally gives the story his own touches by adding detail not found in Vergil, though he is careful in these cases to choose vocabulary

and motifs which are themselves at home in high poetry; see 557–8n., 564n., 566n., 574n., 577–8n.

Perhaps more interestingly, Ovid alters some of the details of the Vergilian story with the effect that the binary opposition between Hercules and Cacus become even more acute. Cacus is portrayed in an even more negative light as the constant malefactor: not only does he cause the conflict by stealing the cattle, but he also initiates the physical combat (569–70n.), and is reprimanded as a coward for resorting to fire-breathing (571–2nn.). Hercules, on the other hand, loses his typical trait as a strongman of limited intelligence (Small (1982) 27) and emerges as a man who is both perceptive (see 548n.) and articulate (see 561n.). Furthermore, he defeats Cacus with relative ease without resorting to anger (his traditional trait) or being frustrated; see 561n., 566n.

To summarise, Ovid's version of the Hercules and Cacus myth is largely based on the serious, complex myth in Vergil's epic, and is intended to be read as a grand, epic-style episode, in the same way as the previous story of Evander's arrival into Italy. As such, the story adds to the 'mini-epic' that Ovid has constructed in this section; see 469–542 (i) n.

543 boves . . . Erytheidas: the adjective *Erytheis* ('of Erythea') appears to be an Ovidian coinage and is not found again outside his poetry; cf. 5.649–50 *victor abit, secumque boves, Erytheida praedam,/ abstrahit* (Hercules). Erythea is the legendary island in the far west which is traditionally the home of the monstrous Geryon, from whom Hercules has won his present cattle; for the story, cf. Hes. *Th.* 287–94, 979–83, Hdt. 4.8ff., Prop. 4.9.2.

The phrase is therefore a grandly-expressed clue to the identity of the hero. A notable feature of this story is the way in which references to Hercules are constantly varied: he is alluded to by his weaponry (*claviger* (544)), his homeland (*Tirynthius actor* (547)), twice by cult names (*ultor* (562) and *victor* (580)) and twice by parentage (*Iove natus* (559) and *Alcides* (575)). He is only directly named at the very end (584).

adplicat: 'leads, drives (to a place)'; cf. 3.750, *Met.* 7.223 *Cretes regionibus adplicat angues* (Medea), Verg. *A.* 1.616, *Thes.* 2.297.13ff.

544 emensus . . . iter: *iter emetior* is a common idiom to express the completion of a journey; cf. Verg. *A.* 7.160–1 *iamque iter emensi turris ac tecta Latinorum/ ardua*, 11.244, Liv. 21.43.9, 26.41.16, Luc. 9.735, *Thes.* 5.2.481.55ff.

claviger, 'club-bearer', is a favourite Ovidian epithet for Hercules coined by our poet; cf. 4.68, *Met.* 15.22, 284, *Ib.* 251, *Thes.* 3.1316.61ff. Elsewhere, the epithet can be ornamental, but in this story the *clava* of Hercules will play an important part; cf. 575–6. For the allusive references to Hercules in this story, see 543n.

longi . . . orbis iter "a long journey over the world": *longus* is transferred here from *iter* to *orbs* (hypallage: see 130n.).

545–6 Hercules is entertained at the home of Evander, whilst his cattle roam unguarded outside. This is different from many other traditions, which say that Hercules falls asleep on the ground before his grazing cattle; cf. Liv. 1.7.4, Dion. Hal. 1.39.2, [Aur. Vict.] *Orig.* 7.1; see also 545n.

545 dumque huic hospitium domus est Tegeaea "While the Arcadian house was a place of hospitality towards him": cf. 5.647 *excipit hospitio iuvenem Pallantius heros* (Evander's hospitality to Hercules). The specific idiom here, *esse hospitium* 'to be a place of hospitality', is very rare and first found in Ovid; cf. *Pont.* 1.8.70 *et hospitium sit tua villa meum*, *Pan.* 10.1.3 (to Emperor Maximian) *ut esse posset domus Caesarum quae Herculis fuisset hospitium*, *Thes.* 6.3.3040.62ff. It is a striking way of drawing attention to the fact that Evander from the outset welcomes the stranger into his house as a guest, an act which is encouraged and practised in the Greek and Roman worlds as far back as Homer; cf. Cic. *Off.* 2.64ff.; D. Konstan (1997), *Friendship in the Classical World*, Cambridge, 33ff., 86f.

The scenario here is markedly different from many other traditions of the myth. First, some traditions differ in the chronology, saying that Hercules only visits Evander *after* his defeat of Cacus; cf. Dion. Hal. 1.40, [Aur. Vict.] *Orig.* 7.4. But others directly contest what Ovid says here, suggesting that Evander is initially *hostile* to the stranger Hercules, and only receives him after he has defeated Cacus and given proof of his divine parentage; cf. Liv. 1.7.9ff., Serv. *A.* 8.269 *Hercules primo non est ab Evandro susceptus.* In other traditions, the theft of Hercules' cattle actually constitutes a direct violation of the laws of hospitality; cf. Prop. 4.9.7–8 *sed non infido manserunt hospite Caco / incolumes: furto polluit ille Iovem* (Cacus as both host and thief), also [Aur. Vict.] *Orig.* 6.2 (citing Cassius Hemina as a source), Serv. *A.* 8.190 (Cacus as treacherous slave of Evander); for discussion of the variant traditions, see Small (1982) 22–4.

Ovid's insistence, therefore, that Evander shows proper hospitality to Hercules right at the outset challenges these other traditions,

and puts Evander (and Carmentis) in a good light, which is in keeping with Ovid's praise of the two under this calendar entry. Ovid may well be making directly a point which is either implicit or ambiguous in Vergil. At Verg. *A.* 8.362–5, Evander's statement that Hercules visits him does not make clear whether this takes place before or after his defeat of Cacus. However, it has been plausibly suggested that Hercules is entertained by Evander prior to the fight, and that the reason for the delay in mentioning the visit lies in Vergil's keenness not to interrupt the larger-than-life mythological episode with such human-level dealings; see George (1975) 56.

Tegeaea "Arcadian": Tegea, originally an ancient town in south-east Arcadia, becomes a popular metonym for Arcadia itself; cf. 627, 6.531 (Carmentis), 2.167, *Ars* 2.55 (Callisto), Verg. *G.* 1.18, *A.* 8.459.

546 incustoditae: the adjective, first found in Ovid, is often applied to animals; cf. *Met.* 2.684–5 *incustoditae Pylios memorantur in agros/processisse boves*, 3.15, *Tr.* 1.6.10, *Thes.* 7.1.1100.80ff. Ovid is particularly fond of creating adjectives of *in* + past participle; for listings, see McKeown on *Am.* 2.9.52, Kenney (2002) 66–7.

lata (**Aω**): the popular alternative reading *laeta* (**Uζς**) is defensible, as it appears in the Livian description of the pasture land used by Hercules' cattle; cf. Liv. 1.7.4 *ut quiete et pabulo laeto reficeret boves.* However, the idyllic image of wide-open fields is found elsewhere in Ovid (cf. 2.210, *Her.* 12.48, *Am.* 1.7.8), and complements the sense of *vagantur* (545).

547–8 In all details here, this couplet is closely modelled on Liv. 1.7.6: *Hercules ad primam auroram somno excitus . . . partem abesse numero sensisset.*

547 mane erat: the formula is first found in Propertius; cf. Prop. 2.29b.23–4 *mane erat, et volui, si sola quiesceret illa,/visere*, Ov. *Her.* 12.64, 14.79, *Thes.* 8.280.10ff. Here the phrase acts as a dramatic motif in much the same way as *nox erat* (see 421n.). As morning is traditionally a peaceful time, it can act as an effective foil for troublesome human events in progress; cf. e.g. *Met.* 11.710–11 *mane erat: egreditur tectis ad litus et illum/maesta locum repetit* (Alcyone is soon to find her dead husband washed up on the shore), Verg. *A.* 4.584ff. (distraught Dido sees Aeneas leave) with Pease ad loc.

excussus somno "shaken out of sleep" or "having shaken himself out of sleep": the idiom is most commonly used of a sudden, worried awakening and often, as here, anticipates a problematic event for the person concerned; cf. 4.555 *excutitur somno . . . pia mater* (mother

awakes to see her baby in the fire), *Her.* 13.109 (distraught Laodamia), Verg. *A.* 2.302 (Aeneas awakes at the attack of the Greeks), *Thes.* 5.2.1310.32ff.

Tirynthius: Tiryns is the legendary home of Hercules in Argolis (Serv. *A.* 7.662), and as such the adjective becomes a popular epithet or substantive for the hero; for the epithet; cf. e.g. 2.305, 349, *Ars* 2.221, Verg. *A.* 7.661–2; for the substantive, cf. e.g. 5.629, *Ars* 1.187, *Met.* 9.66, Verg. *A.* 8.228.

actor "drover" (Frazer): *actor* is Heinsius' emendation of the (unintelligible) majority reading *auctor* (**A**), though the readings and emendations here are varied; cf. *hospes* (**UMς**), *heros* (**Gω**) (both regarded as glosses); *actos* (Le Bonniec (1960) 199). *actor* in the sense 'drover' is very rare, but one might claim Ovidian precedent; cf. *Her.* 1.95 *pecorisque Melanthius actor edendi*, *Ilias Latina* 489 Baehrens *non actor gregis ipse comes*, *Thes.* 1.445.65ff. In these examples, however, we should note that *actor* is felt to need a qualifier (*pecoris, gregis*) to convey the appropriate sense; if we accept Heinsius, Ovid's usage here is strictly unparalleled.

548 de numero . . . duos: Ovid suggests that two bulls are stolen by Cacus. This is markedly different from other traditions, in which the number of stolen beasts is given at eight, if it is specified at all; cf. Verg. *A.* 8.207–8 (4 bulls, 4 heifers), [Aur. Vict.] *Orig.* 7.2 (8 bulls); Liv. 1.7.5, Dion. Hal. 1.39.2 and Prop. 4.9.12 suggest only that more than one was stolen. It has been suggested that this marked reduction in number is an attempt on the part of the poet to create a sense of realism, in that Cacus could surely only manage to steal two bulls in one foray; see Le Bonniec on 548. But this is not in line with Ovid's later acknowledgement of the superhuman strength of the robber; cf. 553–4 *vires pro corpore, corpus/grande.* It is more likely that the reduction in number serves to enhance Ovid's portrayal of Hercules as a man of some intellect and perception. In some traditions, Hercules does not notice the theft at all, and is actually obliviously driving on until he is alerted to the theft by the bulls' lowing from a cave; cf. Verg. *A.* 8.213ff., Prop. 4.9.13, [Aur. Vict.] *Orig.* 7.3. Ovid is here following Liv. 1.7.6 and Dion. Hal. 1.39.3 in portraying Hercules as a perceptive character who realises instantly that some of his cattle are missing. Might we therefore see this reduction of bulls to two—note the emphatic placement of *duos*—as strengthening this sense of astuteness (Hercules notices when only *two* are missing)?

549 taciti . . . furti: since *furtum* already contains the notion of stealth, 'silent theft' is an emphatic pleonastic phrase, which is not found elsewhere among the Augustan poets.

550 traxerat aversos Cacus in antra ferox "Fierce Cacus had dragged them backwards into his cave": the cattle are driven backwards so that their prints appear to lead from, rather than to the cave, an event described in much the same language in the other traditions; cf. Liv. 1.7.5 *aversos boves . . . caudis in speluncam traxit*, Verg. *A.* 8.210 *cauda in speluncam tractos*, Prop. 4.9.12 *aversos cauda traxit in antra boves*, Dion. Hal. 1.39.2, [Aur. Vict.] *Orig.* 7.2 *boves in speluncam . . . caudis abstraxisse.* This cunning manoeuvre is first found adopted by Hermes in his attempt to steal the divine cattle from the gods (cf. Hom. *h. Merc.* 73ff.), and may attribute to Cacus a level of intelligence in line with his earliest portrayal as a seer; see Small (1982) 10–12. The use of the pluperfect (*traxerat*) adds variety to an otherwise purely chronological retelling of a familiar myth; cf. 563 *praestruxerat.*

551–8 Having just mentioned the villain for the first time in 550, Ovid embarks on a detailed description of Cacus, which falls into four parts. Lines 551–2 give us a general impression of the fear he commands among all in the region. This is followed by a description of his monstrous proportions, due in no small part to his divine parentage (553–4), and the vast secluded cave in which he resides (555–6). The section ends in 557–8 with a description of the cave's door and floor, which is laden with trophies of human limbs and bones.

It has been suggested that this long descriptive passage is the most significant in a list of features which halts the narrative flow of the story and reduces the sort of tension and drama which the Vergilian version achieves; see Otis (1970) 33ff. Such views are influenced by Heinze, who famously observed that the fondness for descriptive passages in elegy impinges on the ability of elegiac narrative to create dramatic build-up and maintain momentum; see Heinze (1919) 8, 84, Little (1970) 81ff.; for Heinze, see also 259–76n.

This view is unfair: though the descriptive passage in 551–8 does mark a break in the narrative proper, the accumulation of detail creates a powerful dramatic effect. Cacus is built up as a true *monstrum*, a creature who is placed outside the sphere of civilised conduct in both the symbolic and geographical sense, such that he resembles closely the character found in Vergil; see individual nn. In the other traditions, Cacus is portrayed in more ordinary terms; cf. Liv. 1.7.5, [Aur. Vict.] *Orig.* 7.2 (Cacus is merely a human of

great strength), Dion. Hal. 1.39.4 (Cacus is a robber who has to call on neighbours for assistance); even though Propertius gives Cacus the monstrous aspect of three mouths (Prop. 4.9.10), the brevity of the description and his apparent helplessness when faced with Hercules, make him a very unimposing character. The final detail of the section in 557–8—the abundance of strewn human limbs around the cave—provides a particularly chilling climax before the continuation of the narrative: not only is Cacus incompatible with civilised man, but he also appears (so far) to have won the contest between the two. Given the truly horrific portrayal of Cacus here, one could argue that the descriptive passage in 551–8, far from detracting from the story's momentum, creates a dramatic tension before the ensuing fight, as we realise just how fearsome an opponent Cacus will prove for the hero.

551 Cacus: the name is repeated from 550 to enhance the flow from one couplet to another. This technique (*epanalepsis*) is used sparingly by Ovid; see Wills (1996) 161.

Aventinae timor atque infamia silvae "fear and disgrace of the Aventine wood": Ovid is not alone in suggesting that Cacus has connections with the Aventine, on which the cattle theft takes place, close to his lair; cf. 4.67–8, 6.82 *Cacus Aventinam sanguine tinxit humum*, Verg. *A.* 8.230–1 *ter totum fervidus ira/ lustrat Aventini montem* (Cacus' hideaway is situated on the Aventine), Prop. 4.9 (battle between Hercules and Cacus takes place close to the shrine of the Bona Dea, i.e. on the Aventine), Solinus 1.8 *qui Cacus habitavit locum . . . ubi Trigemina nunc porta* (the Triple Gate is situated between the Aventine and the Tiber). Curiously, however, Cacus is also closely associated with the Palatine, given the existence of the *Scalae Caci* ('Staircase of Cacus') which is carved into the rock going up the Palatine; cf. Diod. Sic. 4.21.2, Plu. *Rom.* 20.5. It has been plausibly suggested that early myths portrayed Cacus as a resident of the Palatine; at a later stage, during the development of the Hercules and Cacus myth, the encounter was transferred to the Aventine; for discussion, see Small (1982) 18–21, 29–34.

According to *Thes.* 7.1.1339.74ff., the transferred use of *infamia* to refer to a person is found first in Ovid, and only twice elsewhere; cf. *Met.* 8.97 *di te submoveant, o nostri infamia saecli* (Minos to Scylla), *Ilias Latina* 257–8 Baehrens *'o dedecus' inquit/ 'aeternum patriae generisque infamia nostri.* The transferred use of *timor* is much more common; cf. *Met.* 3.291, 12.612 *iam timor ille Phrygum* (Achilles) with Bömer ad

loc., Hor. *S.* 1.4.67, Prop. 3.7.13. The combination of the two has an elevated feel, in much the same way as the earlier (praising) collocation *decus et tutela* (415n.).

552 non leve . . . malum "no insignificant evil": *non levis* is a popular Ovidian means of expressing something of particular consequence; cf. 3.230, 4.915 *vis tua non levis est* (Mildew), 5.77, *Am.* 2.14.26, *Her.* 16.18, *Ars* 3.686, *Rem.* 590, *Pont.* 1.7.50, 2.8.54, *Tr.* 2.472. However, given the strong generic overtones of *levis* (see 261n.), it may be possible to read this as a generic statement (i.e. 'no elegiac-style monster') which champions the 'epic' manner in which this episode is narrated; see 469–542n., 543–82 (ii) n.

Referring to Cacus as *malum* is a learned pun, as his name is often associated with κακός ('bad'); cf. Serv. *A.* 8.190 *novimus autem malum a Graecis* κακόν *dici*, August. *C.D.* 19.12, O'Hara (1996) 204; for the 'falsity' of this etymology, see Small (1982) 7–9. As such, Cacus proves etymologically to be the binary opposite of Evander, the 'good man' (εὖ ἀνδρός).

553–4 dira viro facies, vires pro corpore, corpus/grande "the man had a dreadful face, his strength was like his body, and his body was huge": the phraseology keeps the reader in suspense as to the full meaning of the sentence until the last word *grande* (emphatically placed), at which point logical connections can be made. These monstrous dimensions of Cacus are only elsewhere detailed by Vergil; for his dreadful face, cf. Verg. *A.* 8.194 *semihominis Caci facies . . . dira*; for his strength, shown by his movement of a huge rock, cf. Verg. *A.* 8.225ff. Ovid takes the opportunity to indulge here in etymological play between *vir* and *vis*; cf. Lact. *Opif.* 12.16 *vir nuncupatus est, quod maior in eo vis est quam in femina*, Isid. *Orig.* 11.2.17, Maltby 647 s.v.

553 viro: given that Ovid is keen to stress how monstrous and inhuman Cacus is (see 554n.), it is intriguing that, on two occasions, he refers to Cacus as *vir*; cf. 576 *ter quater adverso sedit in ore viri* (Hercules strikes Cacus).

To account for this, we might read the references to Cacus as both *vir* and *monstrum* (554) as a neat way of expressing the 'semihuman' status with which he is attributed by Vergil; cf. Verg. *A.* 8.194 *semihominis Caci facies*. It is also worth noting, however, that *vir* is often used in the oblique cases in poetry as a substitute for *is*; see Tarrant on Sen. *Thy.* 199.

554 grande: throughout the episode, Ovid is keen to portray Cacus as a character of huge proportions and deeds: he has a huge,

vast cave (*longis* . . . *ingens* (555)), a wide body (*lato* (578)), kills so many beings that his floor is whitened with bones (558), breaks off part of a mountain (*fracti* . . . *montis* (563)) and breathes fire comparable with Etna (573–4)). On the other side too, Hercules is viewed as a character who can topple a huge boulder which can be heard by the gods themselves (565–8). The consistent hyperbole raises the episode on to a superhuman plane in a way which is reminiscent of Vergil; see individual nn. and, for a list of hyperbole in the Vergilian version, see Hardie (1986) 117.

pater . . . Mulciber: Ovid follows the Vergilian tradition by making Cacus the monstrous son of Vulcan; cf. Verg. *A.* 8.198 *huic monstro Volcanus erat pater. Mulciber* is an established alternative name for Vulcan, apparently derived from his traditional role as forger, where he would soften (*mulcere*) metal in the heat; for the name, cf. e.g. 6.626, *Met.* 2.5, 9.423, *Ars* 2.562, Pl. *Epid.* 34, Cic. *Tusc.* 2.23; for the etymology, cf. Serv. *A.* 8.724 *Mulciber Vulcanus, ab eo quod totum ignis permulcet*, Macr. 6.5.2, Maltby 394 s.v.

monstri: *monstrum*, derived from *moneo* (warn), is originally a religious term which conveys any type of supernatural occurrence; cf. e.g. Verg. *A.* 2.680 (flame from Iulus' head), 3.26 (branch dripping blood). From here, it becomes a term to describe any uncanny entity, with particularly negative overtones; cf. 5.35 (Giants), *Met.* 5.216 (Medusa's head), Verg. *A.* 2.245 (Trojan horse), Nisbet/Hubbard on Hor. *Carm.* 1.37.21.

555–6 Ovid continues to emphasise the monstrous nature of Cacus by accumulating detail which shows that he is set apart from civilised man: he lives in a huge cave rather than a conventional human dwelling (*proque domo*), which is hidden away (*abdita*, emphatic by diaeresis); ultimately, he seems to be even further removed from civilisation than wild beasts themselves (*vix ipsis invenienda feris*).

555 longis spelunca recessibus ingens: Cacus resides in a huge cave with an extensive, labyrinthine structure, a detail related in much the same phraseology by Vergil; cf. Verg. *A.* 8.193 *hic spelunca fuit vasto summota recessu.* Both poets here liken Cacus to the uncivilised Giant Polyphemos who lives in a large cave apt for harbouring animals; cf. Hom. *Od.* 9.237ff., Verg. *A.* 3.618–19 *domus sanie dapibusque cruentis,/intus opaca, ingens*; for other Gigantomachic overtones in the story, see 543–82 (ii) n.

557–8 The gruesome depiction of the floor and door decorations of Cacus' cave is a clear remodelling of Vergil; cf. Verg. *A.* 8.195–7 *semperque recenti/caede tepebat humus, foribusque adfixa superbis/ora virum tristi*

pendebant pallida tabo. For good measure, Ovid adds the disturbing detail of human arms (*bracchia*) used as pendants.

However, whereas Vergil concentrates on the warmth of the ground due to the recent bloodshed, Ovid opts instead for the equally grotesque image of the ground whitened by the ubiquity of bones, a motif predominantly found in high poetry to express mass human destruction, particularly after warfare; cf. 3.707–8 *testes estote, Philippi,/et quorum sparsis ossibus albet humus* (battle at Philippi); Hom. *Od.* 12.45–6 (destruction caused by the Sirens); Verg. *A.* 5.864–5 (Sirens), 12.36 *campique ingentes ossibus albent* (war in Latium); Sen. *Oed.* 94 (Sphinx); Luc. 7.538 (Pharsalus); Stat. *Silv.* 2.7.65 (Philippi); Sidon. *Ep.* 3.2.1 (attack of the Visigoths). The use of the motif here to describe the genocide caused by just one individual only adds to Cacus' dangerous and monstrous nature.

The propensity of bones strewn around the cave might carry the further implication that Cacus is a cannibal and, as such, comparable to Polyphemos; cf. Hom. *Od.* 9.287–93 (though the Cyclops even eats the bones!); see 543–82 (ii) n.

557 ora "heads, skulls": a mostly poetic usage of *os* to refer to the whole head; cf. *Met.* 4.656, Cic. *Ver.* 2.4.124, Verg. *A.* 8.197, *Thes.* 9.2.1087.72ff.

559 servata male parte boum: two renderings are possible here. *male* can have a negative force, practically synonymous with *non*; cf. 571, 3.102 *Graecia, facundum sed male forte genus, Met.* 4.521, Verg. *A.* 4.8, Hofmann (1951) 201, Bömer on 559. As such, *servata male* would mean essentially 'not protected'; the phrase would therefore refer to the cattle that are stolen by Cacus. It is taken in this way by Peter ("*male servata = amissa*"), Frazer ("with the loss of part of the herd"), Schilling and Boyle/Woodard ("with part of the herd lost"). Alternatively, *male* can often take a virtually negative force, particularly in conjunction with verbs, such that it is equivalent to *vix*; cf. *Am.* 1.14.51 *lacrimas male continet*, Hor. *S.* 2.6.87, Verg. *G.* 1.360, *A.* 2.23, *Thes.* 8.243.21ff. *servata male* would then mean 'scarcely protected/protected with difficulty' and would refer to the cattle that are still in Hercules' possession; see Bömer, Nagle "the poorly-guarded remnant". It is difficult to choose between these renderings.

560 mugitum rauco furta dedere sono: Ovid relates the most crucial turning-point of the episode, namely that it is the lowing of the stolen cattle from the cave which alerts Hercules to their location; cf. Prop. 4.9.13 *furem sonuere iuvenci*, [Aur. Vict.] *Orig.* 7.3. More

elaborate versions suggest that some form of interaction takes place between the two groups of cattle, whereby the stolen cattle respond to the lowing of their free colleagues; cf. Liv. 1.7.7 *boves . . . relictorum mugissent, reddita inclusorum ex spelunca boum vox*, Verg. *A.* 8.213–16, Dion. Hal. 1.39.3.

There may be a particular reason for Ovid's simplification of the story here. In the previous story of Priapus and Lotis (393–440), the fortune of the malefactor Priapus is, as here, radically altered by the surprise lowing of an animal; cf. 433–4 *ecce rudens rauco Sileni vector asellus/intempestivos edidit ore sonos.* This correlation of circumstance between the two stories, aided by similar phraseology (*rauco/rauco, dedere/edidit, sono/sonos*), creates a subtle sense of continuity between different episodes in different parts of the calendar; for another example of continuity, see 479n.; for the motif of timely/untimely utterance, see 445n.

mugitum . . . dedere: for the poetic nature of such idioms created with *do*, see 507n. Only here and at *Met.* 15.510 does Ovid construct the idiom with *do*, elsewhere preferring *edo*; cf. *Her.* 14.91, *Met.* 1.637 *conata queri mugitus edidit ore* (Io), 7.597–8, 14.409, *Tr.* 5.1.54.

furta "stolen goods": though *furta* is used before in this metonymic sense (cf. e.g. Hor. *S.* 2.4.79), Ovid is here the first to apply the term to a living entity; cf. Sen. *Oed.* 716 *fessus per orbem furta sequi Iovis* (Io), Claud. *Rapt.* 3.145, *Thes.* 6.1.1648.26ff. This novel usage might be a response to the ingenuity of his predecessor Propertius, who colours his telling of this part of the story with the witty suggestion that the cattle cry 'thief!'; cf. Prop. 4.9.13 *furem sonuere iuvenci.*

561 accipio revocamen "I acknowledge the summons to return": *revocamen*, used only by Ovid, is one of seventeen new coinages in -*men* introduced into Latin by our poet; cf. *Her.* 13.133 *sed quid ago? revoco? revocaminis omen abesto* (Laodamia to Protesilaus), *Met.* 2.596–7 *talia dicenti 'tibi' ait 'revocamina' corvus/'sint precor ista malo: nos vanum spernimus omen* (raven to the crow); J. Perrot (1961), *Les Dérivés latins en—men et—mentum*, Paris, 111. In all three examples, *revocamen* would seem to denote a particular type of omen which bids the receiver to turn back their course. If this is correct, it suggests that Hercules here has recognised a specific omen in the cattle's lowing, and is duly observing it.

These are the only words which Hercules utters in the entire episode and, whatever *revocamen* means exactly, they certainly have a solemn, grandiose feel. Such an utterance at this stage from Hercules

marks him out as a calm and articulate individual whose subsequent actions might be at least partly based on religious grounds (note also the religious overtones of *impia* in 562). This is markedly different from some other traditions, in particular Vergil, where it is Hercules' blind rage which spurs him into action against Cacus; cf. Verg. *A.* 8.219–20 *hic vero Alcidae furiis exarserat atro/felle dolor*, 228 *furens*, 230 *dentibus infrendens* . . . *fervidus ira*, Prop. 4.9.14 *furis et implacidas diruit ira fores*, 62. Hercules' traditional anger is absent from Ovid's account, as he presents a more rational, level-headed superhero; see also 543–82 (ii) n., 548n.

vocemque: reinforcing the sense of *revocamen*, *vox* is commonly used of any sound which comes from the mouth of an animal; cf. e.g. 6.343 (Silenus' ass), *Met.* 2.538 (birds), 4.589 *hanc illi vocem natura reliquit* (Cadmus as a snake), Prop. 3.3.12.

562 ultor: *ultor* and *victor* are both well-attested readings here, and both are acceptable epithets for Hercules; for *victor*, cf. 5.649, *Met.* 9.136, Verg. *A.* 7.661–2 *postquam Laurentia victor/Geryone exstincto Tirynthius attigit arva*; J. Bayet (1926), *Les Origines de l'Hercule romain*, Paris, 358 (*victor* or *invictus* are cult names from his foundation of the Ara Maxima); for *ultor*, cf. Verg. *A.* 8.201–2 *nam maximus ultor/tergemini nece Geryonae*. It is *ultor*, however, that allows a better sense of progression: he is the avenger of the crime here and, when he kills Cacus, he is *victor* (580).

563–78 Ovid focuses on the huge proportions of the combat between Hercules and Cacus, from the hero's moving of the door barricade to the final death blow to the monster. In this, he is closely following Vergil (see nn.). These are the only two versions to give any detail of the fight, which is summarily passed over by other authors; cf. Liv. 1.7.7 *Cacus vi prohibere conatus esset, ictus clava* . . . *occubuit*, Prop. 4.9.15–16 *Maenalio iacuit pulsus tria tempora ramo/Cacus*, Dion. Hal. 1.39.4, [Aur. Vict.] *Orig.* 7.4 *interfectoque Caco.*

563–4 The scene of Cacus barricading his cave door in anticipation of the hero's arrival is related in present tense narrative at Verg. *A.* 8.225–7, after the monster has escaped from Hercules.

563 ille, following the usual rule, refers to the former character mentioned, i.e. Cacus (551–8); *hic* in 565 refers to the latter, Hercules (559–62).

fracti . . . obice montis "with a barricade of broken-off mountain": this is emphatic hyperbole to convey the huge rock moved by Vergil's monster to block the entrance to his cave; cf. Verg. *A.*

8.225–7 *ut sese inclusit ruptisque immane catenis/deiecit saxum, ferro quod et arte paterna/pendebat, fultosque emuniit obice postis.*

The suggestion here that Cacus is someone who can break off part of a mountain likens him to the monstrous Giants, who traditionally broke off mountains so that they could pile them up to make an assault on heaven (cf. *Met.* 1.151–3, Hom. *Od.* 11.313ff., Verg. *G.* 1.278–83); he is also likened to Polyphemos, who uses a torn-off mountain peak as a weapon (Hom. *Od.* 9.481). The Gigantomachic overtones here help to raise the episode on to the cosmic scale of Vergil's account; see 543–82 (ii) n.

praestruxerat "had blocked up": for this sense, cf. *Ars* 2.21, *Met.* 14.797–8 *portaque nequiquam rigidis promissa Sabinis/fonte fuit praestructa novo*, Oros. *Hist.* 3.12.16, *Thes.* 10.2. 944.30ff. For narrative variation with the pluperfect, cf. 550.

564 vix iuga movissent quinque bis illud opus "Scarcely could ten yokes of animals (i.e. twenty beasts) have shifted that workmanship": an aside to the reader to convey the sheer mass of the rock in more familiar, down-to-earth terms. This particular comparison involving yoked animals is an established tag with grand epic credentials, found first in Homer; cf. Hom. *Od.* 9.240–2 αὐτὰρ ἔπειτ' ἐπέθηκε θυρεὸν μέγαν ὑψόσ' ἀείρας,/ὄβριμον. οὐκ ἂν τόν γε δύω καὶ εἴκοσ' ἅμαξαι/ἐσθλαὶ τετράκυκλοι ἀπ' οὔδεος ὀχλίσσειαν (Cyclops moving his cave door barrier into position); *Met.* 12.432 *caudice qui misso, quem vix iuga bina moverent* (battle of Lapiths and Centaurs); Lucil. 247–8, 435–6 Marx; *Thes.* 7.2.640.45ff.; cf. also Hom. *Il.* 5.302–4, 20.285–7 (heroes move a stone which two of today's mortals could not lift). The obvious similarity of circumstance in which the tag arises here and in *Odyssey* is particularly significant, correlating Cacus with the Cyclops and reinforcing the Gigantomachic impression of Cacus; see 543–82 (ii) n.

quinque bis: the practice of expressing numbers as multiples (with *bis* and *ter*) is evidently still regarded as a feature of high poetry by Ovid, as it is found mostly in *Met.* and *Fasti*; cf. *Thes.* 2.2008.79ff., H.-Sz. 212. This particular collocation is common in Ovid; cf. 28 *constituit menses quinque bis esse suo* (Romulus), *Her.* 3.33, *Met.* 8.500, 580, 11.96, *Ib.* 1.

565 (caelum quoque sederat illis) "the sky had also sat on those shoulders": reference is made here to the occasion on which Hercules bore the globe on his shoulders, temporarily relieving Atlas of this duty whilst the latter fetched for Hercules the apples of the

Hesperides; for the story, cf. e.g. Apollod. 2.5.11. It is an exploit which is elsewhere highlighted (as here) to underline Hercules' truly superhuman status; cf. *Her.* 9.17–18, 57–8, *Met.* 9.198, Prop. 4.9.37 *audistisne aliquem, tergo qui sustulit orbem?* (Hercules to maidens).

The use of the pluperfect (*sederat*) suggests that Ovid is following the tradition which places Hercules' assumption of the globe *before* his battles with Geryon and Cacus; for this order of events, cf. Eur. *HF* 403ff., 422ff., Prop. 4.9.37. Other traditions seem to reverse the order (cf. e.g. Apollod. 2.5.10–11); for variations in the ordering of the labours of Hercules; see Bömer on *Met.* 9.182–3.

The parenthesis here is programmatic, in that a reminder of this superhuman deed prepares us for the fact that Hercules will have no trouble moving the boulder; for similar use of the parenthesis, cf. *Met.* 15.364ff., von Albrecht (1964) 124.

566 motu "with one motion": the singular here, juxtaposed to an acknowledgement of the rock's size (*vastum*), highlights the incredible strength of the hero. Ovid's Hercules has a much easier task than his Vergilian counterpart, who is frustrated in his attempt to move Cacus' barrier and eventually sends a rock crashing down from a ledge through the monster's roof (Verg. *A.* 8.228–46); see also 543–82 (ii) n.

conlabefactat "cause to topple over": found nowhere else in Latin, this Ovidian hapax legomenon is a combination of the rare intransitive verb *conlabefio* 'collapse'—only occurring four times, at Lucr. 3.601, 4.697, Caes. *Civ.* 2.6.5, Nep. *Ar.* 1.2—and the transitive verb *labefacto* 'cause to topple' (*Thes.* 7.2.765.46ff.). Its uniqueness adds a grand touch to the narrative.

567–8 The shattering of the rock affects the heavens above (*aethera*) with its crash, and the ground below with its physical weight (568). This is a clear remodelling of Vergil, where Hercules' rock-shifting manoeuvres (albeit a different rock (see 566n.)) have similar wide-ranging repercussions; cf. Verg. *A.* 8.239–40 *impulsu quo maximus intonat aether,/dissultant ripae refluitque exterritus amnis.* Such universal expressions—usually tri-partite (involving sky, water and land) but here bi-partite (sky and land)—are characteristic of stories which have cosmic significance, particularly those involving gods and giants; cf. Hom. *Il.* 20.54ff. (battle between gods), Hes. *Th.* 839ff. (battle between Typhoeus and Zeus), Hardie (1986) 113–14. As with Vergil, Ovid raises the battle on to a cosmic level; see 543–82 (ii) n.

567 fragor aethera terruit ipsum: the fear caused by the crash-

ing is transferred by Ovid from the river in Vergil (Verg. *A.* 8.240 *exterritus amnis*) to the heaven itself; more often it is the underworld which traditionally shows fear at such cosmic occurrences, as it is terrified of being exposed to the light; cf. Hom. *Il.* 20.61ff., Hes. *Th.* 850 with West ad loc. *fragor* is commonly used to denote any type of extensive noise; cf. e.g. 3.368 (thunder), *Met.* 8.340 (crash of trees), 11.365 (beast's frightful noise), 11.485 (stormy sea). However, Ovid may be using *fragor* in the more literal sense of the 'breaking up' of the rock; for *fragor* in this sense, cf. Lucr. 1.747, 5.317, 6.156–7 *denique saepe geli multus fragor atque ruina/grandinis in magnis sonitum dat nubibus alte*, *Thes.* 6.1.1233.39ff.

568 molis: *moles*, which refers to anything of great size, is used here in the sense of 'boulder'; cf. *Met.* 2.12 *pars in mole sedens virides siccare capillos* (sea nymphs depicted on the Sun's palace), 8.357, Verg. *A.* 9.516, Prop. 4.11.23, *Thes.* 8.1342.83ff.

569–70 In Vergil, as soon as the cave has been exposed, it is Hercules who commences the proceedings by lobbing branches and rocks at Cacus from above; cf. Verg. *A.* 8.249–50 *desuper Alcides telis premit, omniaque arma/advocat et ramis vastisque molaribus instat.* Ovid alters this so that Cacus becomes the initiator of the battle (note the emphatic *prima*) by throwing rocks and branches. By recasting the story to make Cacus the constant offender, Ovid only enhances the respective characters' association with good and evil; see 543–82 (ii) n.

569 movet . . . proelia: the idiom appears first in Ovid and is apparently confined to poetry; cf. *Her.* 21.55–6 *vos pace movetis/aspera submota proelia*, *Met.* 14.670–1, Luc. 4.211, *Thes.* 8.1545.74ff.

conlata . . . dextra "hand-to-hand (lit. with right hands brought together)": *manus conferre* is the standard idiom to describe a hand-to- hand combat; cf. Cic. *Font.* 12, Liv. 9.5.10, Verg. *A.* 9.689–90 *iam collecti Troes . . ./et conferre manum . . . audent*, *Thes.* 4.180.55ff. Ovid's variation of the idiom with *dextra* is innovative and only found on one further occasion in Latin; cf. Amm. 27.10.13 *barbari dexteris coiere collatis.*

570 remque . . . gerit: *rem gero* is often used in a military context to express an engagement in combat; cf. e.g. *Met.* 13.103–4 *quo tamen haec Ithaco, qui clam, qui semper inermis/rem gerit et furtis incautum decipit hostem?* (Ajax about Odysseus), *Pont.* 4.7.44, Enn. fr. *Ann.* 248 Sk., Pl. *Am.* 196, Cic. *Font.* 16, Liv. 2.30.12, *Thes.* 6.2.1944.31ff.

stipitibusque may mean 'branches', in accordance with the objects thrown by Hercules in the Vergilian parallel; cf. Verg. *A.* 8.250 *ramis . . . instat.* But *stipes* is a more wide-ranging term than *ramus*, and

its common rendering '(tree) trunk'—c.f. e.g. 3.37, *Met.* 8.369, Cat. 64.289, Verg. *A.* 4.443–4 *altae/consternunt terram concusso stipite frondes*—would certainly add to the hyperbolic nature of the fight.

571 quis ubi nil agitur "when nothing was gained by these means": for *nil/nihil ago* in the sense 'I gain no advantage', cf. *Am.* 3.4.2, *Met.* 6.685 *ast ubi blanditiis agitur nihil,* Pl. *Cas.* 143, Verg. *A.* 11.227, Hor. *S.* 1.9.15, Prop. 1.10.20, *Thes.* 1.1381.42ff.

571–2 patrias male fortis ad artes/confugit, et flammas ore sonante vomit "Cacus, in cowardly fashion, had recourse to his father's skills, and spewed out flames from his roaring mouth": Cacus resorts to fire-breathing, a skill which he acquires from his fire-god parent Vulcan; cf. Verg. *A.* 8.198–9 *huic monstro Volcanus erat pater: illius atros/ore vomens ignis magna se mole ferebat*; for his potential association with Caca, an ancient fire deity of the Palatine, see Small (1982) 32–4. In his narrative here, Ovid has transferred Vergil's phrase *arte paterna* from the chain holding the rock at Cacus' cave door (Verg. *A.* 8.226) to the monster's ability to breath fire (*patrias . . . artes*).

There is a difference in emphasis between Ovid and Vergil. In Vergil, Cacus retaliates with fire right from the outset, an event related with wonder by the narrator Evander; cf. Verg. *A.* 8.251ff., esp. 252 *mirabile dictu.* In Ovid, he starts fighting hand-to-hand (569–70), and his subsequent recourse to fire seems to be reprimanded by the poet as an act of unmanliness and cowardice (*male fortis, confugit*), as a testimony to his inferiority when matched up with the hero, Hercules. Ovid adopts a similar strategy in his account of the fight between Hercules and Achelous in *Met.* 9, where Achelous, unable to match Hercules in straightforward combat, resorts to his own 'underhand' tactics; cf. *Met.* 9.62–3 *inferior virtute, meas devertor ad artes,/elaborque viro longum formatus in anguem.*

571 male fortis "hardly/not brave, i.e. cowardly": for the negative/virtually negative sense of *male*, see 559n.

572 confugit is used here in a transferred sense 'to have recourse to'; cf. e.g. *Ars* 3.270 *nigrior ad Pharii confuge piscis opem,* Cic. *Ver.* 1.78 *civitates . . . ad vim atque ad arma confugient, N.D.* 1.53, Liv. 7.29.4, *Thes.* 4.258.4ff. Since it contains the notion of fleeing (*fugio*), it complements the sense of *male fortis* (571).

ore sonante: this poetic idiom is commonly used of speaking, or the emitting of any other soft sound; cf. *Am.* 3.9.12 (sobbing), *Met.* 8.533, Verg. *A.* 4.183 *tot linguae, totidem ora sonant, tot subrigit auris*

(Rumour), Hor. *S.* 1.4.43–4, Lygd. 4.40 (singing), Luc. 6.621, *Thes.* 9.2.1078.73ff. Here, uniquely, it expresses the louder, more violent sound of spurting flames.

573–4 "As often as Cacus breathed forth these flames, you would believe that Typhoeus were exhaling, and that rapid jets of light were being hurled from Etna's fire": the two elements of this metaphor for Cacus' fire-breathing represent mythical and naturalistic expressions of the same phenomenon. It is popularly related that, in punishment for his attempted assault on heaven, Jupiter imprisoned Typhoeus under the weight of Sicily, with his head placed under Etna; cf. e.g. *Met.* 5.346ff. esp. 352 *degravat Aetna caput*, Pind. *Pyth.* 1.15–28, Hyg. *Fab.* 152, *LIMC* 8.1.147ff. Though Typhoeus is strictly a Titan, he is regularly included among the Giants; cf. *Met.* 14.1, *Pont.* 2.10.23–4, *Ib.* 595–6, Verg. *G.* 1.278ff., Hor. *Carm.* 3.4.53ff. As such, the metaphor represents the most direct attempt to assimilate Cacus to the monstrous Giants; for other Gigantomachic connections, see 543–82 (ii) n.

573 proflat: a rare verb which appears to be largely confined to epic; cf. Verg. *A.* 9.326, V. Fl. 6.435, 7.570–1 *uterque/taurus et immani proflavit turbine flammas*, Stat. *Theb.* 2.77, 11.266.

574 fulgur, used twice elsewhere by Ovid in its usual sense of 'lightning' (*Met.* 3.300, 14.817), is here used in a wider sense to describe something which resembles a flash of lightning; cf. Lucr. 2.164 (rays of sun), V. Fl. 8.61 (flashes of light reflected from a dragon's crest), *Thes.* 6.1.1520.24ff. More specifically, its use to describe the volcanic outbursts of Etna is a clear echo of Lucretius' description of the volcano; cf. Lucr. 1.722–5 *hic Aetnaea minantur/murmura . . . vomat ignis/ad caelumque ferat flammai fulgura rursum.* However, *fulgur . . . iaci* is a striking phrase to refer to the volcano's eruptions, as it reverses the usual direction of *fulgur*, which is more commonly hurled downwards from heaven.

575–6 Hercules kills Cacus with his trusty club, the popular manner of the monster's death which is first found in Livy; cf. Liv. 1.7.7 *ictus clava*, Dion. Hal. 1.39.4, Prop. 4.9.15–16 *Maenalio iacuit pulsus tria tempora ramo/Cacus.* Vergil appears to be alone in adopting the more gruesome death of strangulation for the monster; cf. Verg. *A.* 8.259ff. with Eden ad loc.

575 Alcides is an established papponymic for Hercules, putative grandson of Alceus, which is apparently first encountered at Call.

Dian. 145; cf. e.g. 2.318, 4.66, 5.387, 6.812, *Am.* 3.8.52, *Ars* 3.156, Hor. *Carm.* 1.12.25, Verg. *Ecl.* 7.61 with Clausen ad loc.

clava trinodis "three-knotted club": *trinodis*, probably an Ovidian coinage, is used once elsewhere by our poet; cf. *Her.* 4.115–16 *ossa mei fratris clava perfracta trinodi/sparsit humi* (Theseus' weapon). If the specific number three is relevant at all—it is not, for instance, in the phrase *ter quater* (see 576n.))—it might accord with the belief that the triple nature of weapons is symbolic of more powerful (divine) beings; cf. Serv. *Ecl.* 8.75 *quamvis omnium prope deorum potestas triplici signo ostendatur, ut Iovis trifidum fulmen, Neptuni tridens, Plutonis canis triceps.*

576 ter quater: this type of formula seems to have first appeared in the *makarismos*, where it forms part of ritual blessing, though it is only used in this context once by Ovid; cf. *Pont.* 4.9.34 *ter quater imperii laetus honore tui* (Ovid praises new consul Graecinus), Hom. *Od.* 5.306, Verg. *A.* 1.94, Hor. *Carm.* 1.13.17 with Nisbet/Hubbard ad loc., Prop. 3.12.15, Lygd. 3.26 with Navarro-Antolín ad loc. Instead, Ovid often uses the formula, as here, to emphasise the vigour of an onslaught; cf. *Met.* 4.734 *ter quater exegit repetita per ilia ferrum* (Perseus kills the sea monster), 6.133, 9.217, 12.133 *ter quater ora viri, capulo cava tempora pulsat* (Achilles strikes Cycnus), 12.288, 14.206.

sedit "sunk deep": for *sedeo* referring to weapons lodging deep in an enemy, cf. e.g. Verg. *A.* 10.783–6 *tum pius Aeneas hastam iacit... imaque sedit/inguine* (Aeneas wounds Mezentius), Flor. *Epit.* 2.13.40, Stat. *Theb.* 10.656; cf. also *Met.* 3.88–9 *plagamque sedere/cedendo arcebat* (the serpent tries to evade further wounds).

viri: see 553n.

577–8 Unlike Vergil, Ovid finishes the combat narrative with a final picture of the dying monster. The emphasis lays on the sound of the death fall (*ille cadit... plangit humum*), and the vomiting of blood (*vomit... sanguine*) at the very moment of death (*moriens*). All these features are well-established motifs of the gruesome death descriptions found in epic, ultimately stemming back to Homer; cf. Hom. *Il.* 16.345ff., Ov. *Met.* 5.83–4 *rutilum vomit ille cruorem/et resupinus humum moribundo vertice pulsat* (Perseus kills Eurytus), 5.95–6, 5.292–3 *et cadit in vultus discussisque ossibus oris/tundit humum moriens scelerato sanguine tinctam* (Pyreneus), Verg. *A.* 9.349–50 *purpuream vomit ille animam et cum sanguine mixta/vina refert moriens* (Euryalus kills Rhoetus), 10.348–9, 11.668–9 *sanguinis ille vomens rivos cadit atque cruentam/mandit humum moriensque suo se in vulnere versat* (Camilla kills Eunaeus). The similar-

ity in diction between 577–8 and the Vergilian parallels is particularly striking, showing clearly that Ovid is keen to narrate the story in a truly grand register. The only personalisation of the motif to fit Cacus' specific fire-breathing person is the use of *fumos.*

579 immolat: the verb originally expresses the sprinkling of a victim with meal (*mola*) in preparation for the sacrifice; cf. Cato *Orig.* fr. 55 Peter *Lavini boves immolatos, prius quam caederentur, profugisse in silvam*, Serv. *A.* 4.57 *olim . . . hostiae 'immolatae' dicebantur mola salsa tactae*, Maltby 296 s.v. From here, it commonly takes the general meaning 'sacrifice'; cf. 3.805, 5.516 *immolat et magno torret in igne bovem*, Cic. *Off.* 3.95, Verg. *A.* 10.519.

Iuppiter: Ovid concurs with Dion. Hal. 1.39.4, who likewise mentions that a sacrifice is made to Jupiter to thank him for the retrieval of his cattle. In some traditions, this thanksgiving also leads to the foundation of an altar to Jupiter, under the suitable title of *Inventor* ('Discoverer'); cf. Dion. Hal. 1.39.4, [Aur. Vict.] *Orig.* 6.5ff., Solinus 1.7.

580 victor is a cult name for Hercules following the foundation of the Ara Maxima; see 562n. Hercules is also honoured by two temples in the vicinity which acknowledge his status as victor, namely Hercules Victor and Hercules Invictus; for which, see Platner/Ashby 254, 257–8, Steinby III.15, 22–3.

581 constituitque sibi, quae Maxima dicitur, aram "and he set up for himself an altar which is called the Greatest": the more popular tradition has Hercules himself as the founder of the Ara Maxima; cf. Liv. 1.7.10 *tibique aram hic dicatum iri quam opulentissima olim in terris gens maximam vocet*, possibly Verg. *A.* 8.268ff. (though the reading is unclear [see Eden ad loc.]), Prop. 4.9.67–8, [Aur. Vict.] *Orig.* 8.1; but for Evander as the founder, cf. Dion. Hal. 1.40.2, Tac. *Ann.* 15.41. After the foundation of the altar, charge of the rites changes hands from Evander to the two noble families, the Potitii and the Pinarii, until the state takes over the proceedings in 312 B.C.; cf. Liv. 1.7.12ff., Dion. Hal. 1.40.4, Serv. *A.* 8.270, Steinby III.15ff.

The change of tense from perfect (*constituit*) to present (*dicitur*) creates a distance between the foundation of the altar and its naming, thus avoiding suggestions that Hercules himself boastfully names it the greatest, as is the case with Propertius' hero; cf. Prop. 4.9.67–8 *Maxima quae gregibus devota est Ara repertis,/ara per has . . . maxima facta manus.*

582 hic ubi pars Urbis de bove nomen habet: Ovid refers to the Forum Boarium, the recognised location of the altar (cf. Tac.

Ann. 12.24, Steinby III.15ff.), which derived its name from *bos*, either from the specific cattle of Hercules (Prop. 4.9.16–20 *ite boves/Herculis ite boves . . ./arvaque mugitu sancite Bouaria longo:/nobile erit Romae pascua vestra Forum*) or because the place was originally a cattle market (cf. Fest. 27 L.); see Maltby 82 s.v. For the mimetic approach to topography (*hic ubi*), see 243–4n.

583–4 Carmentis means that Hercules will soon leave the earth to become a god, an event narrated elsewhere by Ovid; cf. *Met.* 9.134ff. esp. 254–5 *idque ego defunctum terra caelestibus oris/accipiam* (Jupiter about Hercules), Hyg. *Fab.* 36, Sen. *Her. O.* A sense of continuity is created by Carmentis' words here, as she is specifically highlighting one of the new major gods that she had prophesied for Italy previously in general terms; cf. 510 *tuque, novos caelo terra datura deos.* The whole scene is a reversal of Livy, where Evander suggests that his mother had revealed to him the divine future of Hercules some time *before* the fight with Cacus; cf. Liv. 1.7.10 *te mihi mater, veridica interpres deum aucturum caelestium numerum cecinit* (Evander to Hercules); cf. also Str. 5.3.230 (Evander's mother—here, Nicostrate—predicts Hercules' deification before the encounter).

583 tacet "pass over in silence (the fact) that": according to *OLD* s.v. 4, this is the first occasion on which *taceo* takes accusative and infinitive; cf. e.g. Plin. *Nat.* 36.6 *etiamne tacuerunt, maximas . . . Lucullei marmoris in atrio Scauri conlocari?*

584 Hercule quo tellus sit satis usa suo "when the earth would have taken sufficient fill of its own hero Hercules": an unusual means of expressing apotheosis, for which I can find no parallel outside Ovid; cf. *Met.* 15.448–9 *quo cum tellus erit usa, fruentur/aetheriae sedes, caelumque erit exitus illi* (Helenus about the Emperor). The possessive *suo* is an intriguing personalised touch.

585–6 Ovid concludes the section with a sentiment which neatly connects the goddess to the calendar: just as Carmentis is always most acceptable to the gods (*dis gratissima*), so she duly claims a position in the month of a god, Janus (*Iani . . . mense*). The final words of the couplet (*mense diem*) bring our attention firmly back to the calendar itself.

585 dis gratissima "most acceptable to the gods": the phrase is used elsewhere of a prophetess by Ovid; cf. *Met.* 14.123 *dis gratissima* (Sibyl).

586 dea: by referring to Carmentis finally as a goddess, Ovid hints that she is another of the *novos* . . . *deos* (510) which are predicted for Italy.

587–616 13th January Octavian's assumption of the title 'Augustus'

587–8 Sacrifice to Jupiter, conducted in the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitoline hill, took place on the Ides of each month, a day sacred to the god; see 56n.

587 Idibus: See 56n.

castus . . . sacerdos refers to the ancient priesthood of Jupiter, the Flamen Dialis, a post which had remained unfilled for seventy-five years until Augustus' appointment of a candidate in 11 B.C.; see Dumézil (1970) 151–4, BNP I.130–2. *castus* here does not imply sexual abstinence: it is suggested elsewhere (Gel. 10.15.22) that the Flamen may have been, or had to be, married. Instead, *castus* refers to the numerous specific abstentions which a priest had to observe—especially the Flamen Dialis—such as the avoidance of raw meat, ivy or goats; cf. Cic. *Leg.* 2.19ff., Gel. 10.15, Plu. *Mor.* 289e–291b.

588 semimaris . . . ovis: a gelded victim is mentioned here, a more specific statement than at 56 (*agna*). Sterile victims may have been reserved for Jupiter; see Frazer on 587; G. Dumézil (1961), "Quaestiunculae Indo-Italicae, 11–16", *REL* 39, 242–50. *semimas*, used elsewhere by Ovid in its literal sense 'half-man'—cf. *Met.* 4.381 (Hermaphroditus), 12.506 (Caeneus)—takes here the extended sense 'emasculated'; cf. 4.183 *semimares* (eunuchs at the festival of Cybele), Var. *R.* 3.9.3 *capi semimares*, Col. 8.2.3.

viscera is used here in a general sense 'innards' (for sacrifice); cf. 672, 3.732 (*viscera* offered to the gods by Liber), *OLD* s.v. 2, Lewis/Short s.v.1. Strictly speaking, it was the *exta* (entrails), rather than the *viscera*, which were offered to the gods at a sacrifice; see 51n.

589 redditaque est omnis populo provincia nostro "(on that day too) every province was handed back to our people": an allusion to Octavian's address to the Senate which, according to both Ovid and the *Fasti Praenestini* (see below), took place on 13th January (27 B.C.). At this meeting, Octavian gave the provinces back to the

people. The Senate responded by giving the provinces straight back to the Emperor. The end result saw Octavian in charge of Spain, Gaul, Syria, whilst the other provinces—known thereafter as the *publicae provinciae* or *provinciae populi Romani* (see F. Millar (1989), "'Senatorial' Provinces: An Institutionalized Ghost", *Ancient World* 20, 93–7)—were allocated by lot to proconsuls. This giving back of the provinces appears to have marked the final stage of Octavian's two-year process of 'restoring the Republic'; for the (discordant) sources, cf. Aug. *RG* 34 *In consulatu sexto et septimo* [28 and 27 B.C.] . . . *rem publicam ex mea potestate in senatus populique Romani arbitrium transtuli*, Fasti Praenestini (Degrassi 113) *Corona querc(ea, uti super ianuam domus Imp. Caesaris) Augusti poner(etur, senatus decrevit, quod rem publicam) p(opulo) R(omano) rest(it)u(it)* [13th January], Dio 53.2–12; see esp. Rich/Williams (1999) 188ff. Ovid's statement, then, refers to Octavian's *initial* decision to abdicate power over the provinces, and glosses over the fact that the Emperor maintained considerable power thereafter.

provincia: the term undergoes a development in meaning, in the first century B.C., from a 'task assigned to a Roman administrator' to an 'area under Roman administration', and it is the latter meaning which fits best here; for the development in meaning, see esp. A. Lintott (1993), *Imperium Romanum: Politics and Administration*, London, 22–7.

590 et tuus Augusto nomine dictus avus "and your grandfather was called by the title 'Augustus'": following Octavian's address to the Senate on 13th January 27 B.C., there was a senatorial debate as to what new title should be conferred on the Emperor. It was L. Munatius Plancus who successfully moved a proposal to confer the title of 'Augustus'; for the reasoning behind the preference, see 609–10n.

Ovid's suggestion here that the assumption of the title took place on the same day as the speech about the provinces (13th) is at odds with other sources; cf. Fasti Praenestini (Degrassi 115) *Imp. Caesar (Augustus est a)ppell(a)tus ipso* [16th January], Feriale Cumanum (Degrassi 279) *Eo d(ie Caesar Augustu)s app(e)llatus est* [15th or 16th January], Cens. 21.8 [17th January]. Simpson (1994) seeks to defend Ovid's dating, arguing that the title may have been conferred by the Senate on 13th, and on one of the later dates (15th) by the people. Our sources, however, seem to imply a staging of the honours given to Octavian (cf. Dio 53.16.4–6), and there is now a general consensus that the title was conferred on one of the later dates; see Lacey (1996) 92–5, Rich/Williams (1999) 203–4.

Though the weight of evidence suggests that Ovid is in error here, the combining of the two events may serve a programmatic pur-

pose: by drawing attention, in successive couplets (587–8, 589–90), to honours made to both Jupiter and Augustus, Ovid neatly forges an initial similarity between the two which will be made explicit at the climax of his eulogy at 608 (see n.); see further Herbert-Brown (1994) 200–4.

The addressee of *tuus . . . avus* is Germanicus, the patron of the poem (cf. 1–26) and grandson of Augustus by adoption. The phraseology promotes a consistency of thought in Ovid's poem, as he has previously promised Germanicus that he would read about his notable family; cf. 10 *saepe tibi pater est, saepe legendus avus*; for the post-Augustan outlook of Book 1, see Introduction, II.

591–2 The poet invites the reader to scrutinise the titles won by famous Roman individuals of the past, and suggests that a title will not be found to equal that of 'Augustus' conferred upon the Emperor. This prepares the way for Ovid's own eulogy to the Emperor (593–616), in which he will highlight notable individuals, before revealing their inferiority to the bearer of the title 'Augustus'.

591 generosa . . . atria "the halls of high-born individuals": for the transferred use of *generosus*, cf. *Her.* 6.113 *si te nobilitas generosaque nomina tangunt*, Apul. *Met.* 3.15, *Thes.* 6.2.1800.51ff.

ceras: *cerae* is here used metonymically for waxen images; see *Thes.* 3.853.5ff. These waxen images are busts of prominent ancestors, which families were accustomed to placing proudly around their halls as inspiration and indication of their nobility; cf. e.g. *Am.* 1.8.65, Sal. *Jug.* 4.5, Prop. 4.11.29ff., Juv. 8.19–20. These images could apparently also be used as masks, worn by certain individuals at the funeral of a family member to symbolise the attendance of all his ancestors; cf. Plb. 6.53, Prop. 2.13.19–20; H. Flower (1996), *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*, Oxford, 32ff. On each of the images was engraved an inscription, stating the name of the individual and a list of their honours, and it is these inscriptions which Ovid invites his audience to read carefully (*perlege*); cf. [Tib.] 4.1.30–1 *nec quaeris quid quaque index sub imagine dicat,/ sed generis priscos contendis vincere honores* (to Messalla), Liv. 10.7.11.

593–616 Eulogy to the bearer of the title 'Augustus'

Ovid constructs a eulogy to the bearer of the title 'Augustus' (593–612) before praying for long life and success for the Emperor and his successor (613–16).

i. *Choices and Interpretation*

This section is challenging because the reader is constantly denied an unambiguous point of reference as to which individual is meant at any one time—a common feature of Ovid's imperial eulogies (see 530n.). The text poses many questions: who is *Caesar* in 599? What is the identity of the bearer of the title 'Augustus' in 608? To whom does *nostri ducis* (613) refer and, consequently, who is his *heres* (615)? No consensus has been reached on these matters; for the differences of opinion, see 599–600n., 608n., 613n., 614n. As the imprecision of the eulogy invites us to choose our point of reference, I propose the following structure, which would ensure both neat verse articulation and, arguably, the greatest effect on Ovid's immediate addressee, Germanicus (see 590n.).

Starting with the eulogy to the bearer of the title 'Augustus' (593–608), both *Caesar* in 599 and *hic* in 608 are probably best understood as referring to Augustus himself. The result is that Ovid has constructed his eulogy in a logical manner. In 593–8 (6 lines) Ovid recalls no fewer than seven prominent individuals who have gained a title from military conquest of a certain city/land. In 599–600 (2 lines) Ovid abruptly puts these individuals into perspective through comparison with the great Augustus: if Octavian had adopted the same policy of gaining titles, he would now surely bear all the names of the world. In 601–6 (6 lines) the poet continues by giving a catalogue of five further characters who have gained titles by other means. However, he again breaks off in 607–8 (2 lines) to put these individuals in their places subordinate to Augustus: their honours are human, his are divine.

After highlighting the religious and imperial connotations of *augustus* (609–12), Ovid concludes the section with praise of the present and future rulers (613–16). It is perhaps best to take these final four lines as referring to the post-Augustan regime, whereby the contemporary Emperor is Tiberius (the *dux* of 613) and his heir (*heres* (615)) is Germanicus. Interpreting the section in this way would ensure that Germanicus, Ovid's patron and immediate addressee, is the sustained focus of attention: he is evoked at the beginning (590), sympathetically treated midway through the eulogy with reference to his late father (see 598n.) and finally, at the climax to the section, eagerly anticipated as the next inheritor of the title (615–16); for the post-Augustan outlook of the poem, see Introduction, II.

ii. *Panegyric Technique*

The panegyric technique adopted in 593–608, whereby a subject is shown to be greater than previous notable figures, either historical or mythological, is by Ovid's day well-established; cf. e.g. Cic. *Marc.* 2.5 (Caesar is praised in general terms above previous historical figures), Verg. *A.* 6.801–5 *nec vero Alcides tantum telluris obivit/... nec qui pampineis victor iuga flectit habenis/Liber* (Augustus reaches further than such mythical characters as Hercules and Bacchus), [Tib.] 4.1.45–53.

But Ovid's technique in this section is different in two ways. First, Ovid calls to mind a much greater number and variety of potential comparative historical individuals—twelve in all. More significantly, his rhetorical style is different. Despite the poet's hint at the beginning that Augustus is the supreme title (592), the other prominent individuals are developed respectfully and in their own right; the result is that they appear to be perfectly comparable to the Emperor. On two occasions (599–600, 607–8), however, the poet abruptly shatters the comparison by reminding us just how superior the Emperor is to his supposed peers. Ovid is the first to use this specific eulogising technique, though it becomes a feature of later panegyric literature. For example, in the Panegyric of Maximian, Maximian's bold conquest of the Germans beyond the Rhine is freely compared to Scipio's conquest of Carthage. However, Maximian's achievement is then abruptly acknowledged as superior because, in following the pre-existing strategy of Scipio, he has shown judgment and has not, like Scipio, taken a risk; cf. *Pan.* 10.8.5 *iteratum vero idem atque repetitum ad certam iudicii gloriam pertinet*; for further examples of this panegyric technique, cf. *Pan.* 9.5–7, 10.10.3; W. Maguinness (1932), "Some Methods of the Latin Panegyrists", *Hermathena* 47, 48ff. In particular, Ovid's eulogy may well have influenced Pliny in his Panegyric of Trajan, when he attempts to flatter the Emperor by highlighting the superiority of his title 'Optimus'. As in our section, Pliny respectfully lists notable families who have gained fine titles, before revealing that Trajan's title overarches them all; cf. Plin. *Pan.* 88.6 *ut olim frugalitate Pisones, sapientia Laelii, pietate Metelli monstrabantur; quae simul omnia uno isto nomine continentur. nec videri potest optimus, nisi qui est optimus omnibus in sua cuiusque laude praestantior.*

The flattery in this section is unproblematic at face-value. It has been suggestively argued, however, that Ovid's eulogy subtly draws

attention to the fact that, far from representing the pinnacle of Republican achievement, Octavian's title amounts to a *breaking* of Republican tradition: the overarching nature of the title masks the new overarching power of the Emperor; see Boyle (2003) 31, 216.

593–6 Ovid gives variety to his catalogue of individuals by constantly changing the subject, from conquered place (*Africa* (593), *Messana* (595)) to conquered people (*Numidae* (595)) to conqueror (*alter* (593), *ille* (596)). There is also variation between place name (*Cretum* (594) and above) and adjective (*Isauras* (593), *Numantina* (596)).

593 Africa victorem de se vocat "Africa names its victor after itself": P. Cornelius Scipio the Elder received the title 'Africanus' following his victory over Hannibal in Africa in 202 B.C., an event which ended the second Punic war; cf. Liv. 30.45.6–7. The title was later inherited by P. Cornelius Scipio the Younger following his conquest of Carthage in 146 B.C.; cf. Cic. *Rep.* 6.10–11.

593–4 alter Isauras/. . . domitas testificatur opes "another individual is testimony to the conquered realm of the Isauri": As proconsul, P. Servilius Vatia waged war on the Cilician pirates and overthrew the city of the Isauri in 75 B.C., the stronghold of Cilicia, for which he received the title 'Isauricus'; cf. Str. 14.3.3, Liv. *Per.* 93, Flor. *Epit.* 1.41.4–6.

Isauras: the adjective *Isaurus* is first found here; see *TLO* 3.588. The uniqueness of the adjective might help to explain popular, yet unintelligible variants for *alter Isauras* (ζω), such as *alitis aura* (**A**ς) and *aleris aura* (**U**).

594 Cretum: Crete was eventually subdued by Q. Metellus (cos. 69 B.C.) after a period of three years from 69–7 B.C., for which he received the title 'Creticus'; cf. Liv. *Per.* 99–100, Flor. *Epit.* 1.42, Vell. 2.34.

595 hunc Numidae faciunt . . . superbum: Q. Metellus (cos. 190 B.C.) won renown following his victory over Jugurtha in Numidia in 109–7 B.C., for which he received the title 'Numidicus'; cf. Sal. *Jug.*, Liv. *Per.* 65, Vell. 2.11.

illum Messana: M. Valerius (cos. 263 B.C.) was the first to conquer Messana in Sicily, and the first to receive the name 'Messalla', which was passed on to his descendants; cf. Sen. *Dial.* 10.13.5, Macr. 1.6.26.

This family was well-known to Ovid. M. Valerius Messalla Corvinus, a statesman and general under Augustus, was the centre of the lit-

erary circle at Rome who first encouraged Ovid to publish his work (*Pont.* 2.3.75–8). However, Ovid built up a much stronger relationship with Messalla's youngest son, M. Aurelius Cotta Maximus, with whom he corresponded frequently from exile (*Tr.* 4.5, *Pont.* 1.5, 9, 2.3, 8, 3.2, 5); see Syme (1978) 125ff.

596 ille Numantina traxit ab urbe notam "yet another drew his distinction from the city of Numantia": in 133 B.C., P. Cornelius Scipio the Younger (by this time Scipio Africanus (see 593n.)), captured and destroyed the city of Numantia in Spain after a long siege, and received the name 'Numantinus'; cf. Cic. *Rep.* 6.11, Liv. *Per.* 56, 57, 59, Flor. *Epit.* 1.34.

notam: the only examples given by *OLD* (s.v. 3b) for *nota* in the figurative sense 'distinction' come from *Fasti*; cf. esp. 6.206 *est ibi non parvae parva columna notae.*

597 et mortem et nomen Druso Germania fecit "Germany created for Drusus both his death and his title": Nero Claudius Drusus, the father of Ovid's patron Germanicus, waged war in Germany across the Rhine, and died there in 9 B.C., either though sickness or from a fall from his horse. He was posthumously awarded several honours, one of which was the title 'Germanicus'; cf. Liv. *Per.* 139, Suet. *Claud.* 1, Vell. 2.97, Dio 55.2.3.

The phraseology here is an example of syllepsis, a favourite figure of Ovid's, whereby two words are joined to a third such that the third must be construed in different ways with each. In our example, the verb *fecit* must be taken at one time in a 'real' sense with *nomen* (Germany literally gives Germanicus his title) and in a more abstract sense with *mortem*; for the figure, cf. 181, 253 *pacem postesque tuebar* (Janus), 299, 649 *hanc tua constituit genetrix et rebus et ara*, 3.549, *Met.* 1.750 with Bomer ad loc., Knox (1995) 28ff., Tissol (1997) 217ff., Kenney (2002) 45ff.

598 me miserum, virtus quam brevis illa fuit! "Woe's me! How short-lived was that valour of his!": the exclamation *me miserum/am*, largely avoided by the Augustan poets (only elsewhere found twice in Prop.), is a favourite of Ovid's, of which there are 45 examples, five in *Fasti*; cf. 3.486 (deserted Ariadne), 4.82 (Ovid), 4.456 (Ceres), 6.447 (Metellus), McKeown on *Am.* 1.1.25, Knox (1986) 56, *Thes.* 8.1106.1ff. In *Fasti*, the poet clearly reserves the exclamation in his own voice for circumstances which are particularly heart-rending for him; cf. 4.82 *me miserum, Scythico quam procul illa solo est!* (distress at

how far his land of exile is from home). Its usage here, then, constitutes a mark of respect to the father of his patron, Germanicus, the immediate addressee of the section (590n.).

The lament for short-lived virtue also bears a passing resemblance to the famous lament for Augustus' nephew, the younger M. Claudius Marcellus, in Anchises' prophecy at Verg. *A.* 6.868ff. (see also 521–2n.).

599–600 "If Caesar were to seek titles from the vanquished, he would assume as many names as the mighty world has races": the ambiguity of *Caesar* allows for two candidates: Julius Caesar (see e.g. Herbert-Brown (1994) 122) or, more popularly, Augustus (see e.g. Frazer, Nagle and Boyle/Woodard). It is worth noting that Ovid is elsewhere ambiguous about the identity of a Caesar who has amassed many titles; cf. 3.419–20 *Caesaris innumeris, quos maluit ille mereri,/accessit titulis pontificalis honor* (Pontifex Maximus, which can apply to both Julius Caesar and Augustus [see 530n.]).

It seems more logical here to take *Caesar* as referring specifically to Augustus: having set up a catalogue of supposed rivals who have gained titles from conquered peoples, Ovid summarily dismisses this by expressing their vast inferiority to the Emperor, who has conquered countless peoples (see 593–616 (i) n.). The reason for Ovid's avoidance of the more specific address 'Augustus' lies in his desire to save dealings with the term *augustus* until the etymological accumulation at 609ff. Besides, *Caesar* is a perfectly respectful way of referring to Augustus in Ovid; cf. e.g. 2.119–44 (Augustus as *Pater Patriae*) where he is referred to twice as Caesar (2.138, 141) and nowhere as Augustus; see further Dickey (2002) 99ff. Against the suggestion that it is Julius Caesar evoked in these lines is the fact that Julius Caesar is definitely alluded to just four lines later (604); it would surely spoil the rhetorical effect if an all-encompassing statement about Julius Caesar's prowess as victor were followed abruptly by detail of a specific victim.

599 sumet (**U**ς): the usual rule for ideal conditions would require *sumat* (**A**ζς) after a present subjunctive verb in the protasis (*si petat*). However, the more difficult reading is preferable on the grounds that Ovid, like several before him, often uses a future indicative in the apodosis of such clauses to emphasise the certainty of the result; cf. e.g. 123–4 *sanguine letifero totus miscebitur orbis,/ni teneant rigidae condita Bella serae*, *Her.* 4.92, *Am.* 2.3.12, *Met.* 3.141–2 *at bene si quaeras, fortunae crimen in illo,/non scelus invenies*, *Tr.* 2.33–4 with Owen ad loc., Pl. *Am.* 703–4, Cic. *Div.* 2.84, K.-St. II.2.395.

600 maximus orbis: for the phrase, cf. e.g. *Tr.* 3.10.77 *ergo, tam late pateat cum maximus orbis*, Verg. *G.* 1.26.

601–2 "Certain notable individuals have received titles from a single entity, either from a despoiled necklace or the aid of a raven": from titles earned from places, Ovid moves to those gained from single items, one inanimate, one animate. For the common links between these two events, see 602n.

601 torquis adempti: T. Manlius received the title 'Torquatus' from the necklace (*torquis*) he captured from a Gaul in combat in 361 B.C.; cf. Quad. fr. 10ab Peter, Liv. 7.10.11 with Oakley ad loc.

602 corvi ... auxiliaris: Ovid alludes to the marvellous event which attended M. Valerius in 349 B.C. at the outset of his combat with a huge, arrogant Gaul. It is told that a raven, sent by the will of the gods, landed on the Roman's helmet and attacked the enemy by scratching his face and eyes, thus allowing M. Valerius to conquer easily. From his assistant bird, he took the title 'Corvus' or 'Corvinus'; cf. Liv. 7.26 with Oakley ad loc., Flor. *Epit.* 1.8, Gel. 9.11. Though *auxiliaris* literally means 'help-bringing', it is commonly used in a military context to denote back-up troops; cf. e.g. Caes. *Civ.* 1.63.1 *duabus auxiliaribus cohortibus Ilerdae praesidio relictis*, Liv. 21.26.5, 24.24.7, Tac. *Ann.* 3.45, *Thes.* 2.1614.32ff. The phraseology here may encourage the idea that the raven was an (unusual) type of 'military reinforcement'.

The two events in the couplet are therefore linked by subject-matter—a Roman's fight with a Gaul—and are typically evoked together; cf. Liv. 7.26.2 *M. ... Valerius ... qui haud indigniorem eo decore se quam T. Manlium ratus*, V. Max. 3.2.6.

603–6 As a climax to the catalogue, Ovid builds up a crescendo—*Magne* (603), *maior* (604), *Maxima* (606)—which signals the pinnacle of mortal titles.

603 "O Magnus, your name is a measure of your achievements": following his defeat of the Marian factions in Sicily and Africa in 81 B.C., Pompey was hailed as 'Magnus' by Sulla or, according to Plutarch, by the army in Africa; cf. Plin. *Nat.* 7.96, Plu. *Pomp.* 13. This style of flattery for the title 'Maximus' is adopted elsewhere by Ovid when addressing Fabius Maximus; cf. *Pont.* 1.2.1 *Maxime, qui tanti mensuram nominis imples.*

604 "but he who conquered you was greater still in name": Pompey was defeated by Julius Caesar at Pharsalus in 48 B.C. For *maior* as part of the crescendo, see 603–6n.

605–6 "Nor is any rank of title above the Fabii: that house was

called Maximus from its own meritorious deeds": the pinnacle of human achievement is reserved for the Fabii; for Ovid's praise of the Fabii elsewhere in the poem, see B. Harries (1991), "Ovid and the Fabii: *Fasti* 2.193–474", *CQ* 41, 150–68. The first of the Fabii to receive the title 'Maximus' was the Censor Q. Fabius Rullianus in 304 B.C., following his decision to confine a particular group (possibly freedmen) to the four urban tribes; cf. Liv. 9.46.14ff., V. Max. 2.2.9. The most famous of the Fabii, included in the pageant of Roman heroes at Verg. *A.* 6.845ff., was Fabius Maximus Cunctator, a title earned from his famous military tactic in defeating Hannibal.

The most recent influential member of this house was Paullus Fabius Maximus, a friend of Ovid's via his wife, who was on intimate terms with Fabius' wife Marcia. Paullus was a good orator and an associate of Augustus, such that the poet in exile elsewhere singles him out as a man who could potentially bring about a mitigation of his sentence; cf. e.g. *Pont.* 1.2.67–70 *suscipe, Romanae facundia, Maxime, linguae, / difficilis causae mite patrocinium . . . lenia pro misera fac modo verba fuga*, Syme (1978) 145–55. Unfortunately, Paullus was either killed or committed suicide in A.D. 14, following a scandal in which he was accused by Augustus of betraying the Emperor's visit to the exiled Agrippa Postumus; for the story, cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.5 with Goodyear ad loc., Plin. *Nat.* 7.150, Syme (1978) 149–51. A post-exilic reading of 605–6 in a eulogy to Augustus is then, at best, ironic; see Boyle (2003) 215.

607–8 After the climactic crescendo of titles in 603–6, Ovid breaks off for the second time to point up the superiority of the title 'Augustus'; for the panegyric technique, see 593–616 (ii) n.

608 hic socium summo cum Iove nomen habet "this one has a name shared with Jupiter on high": Jupiter and another share the name 'Augustus', but the identity of *hic* is not clear. It is popularly taken to refer to Octavian, the first holder of the title (cf. 590); see e.g. Frazer, Bömer, Schilling on 608. As a consequence, the heir to whom Ovid looks forward at the end of the section (*heres* (615)) must be Tiberius. Alternatively, it has been suggested that Ovid wrote the entire section from exile after the death of Augustus, and that *hic* directs our attention to a new subject, the contemporary Emperor Tiberius, who inherited the title in his father's will (Suet. *Tib.* 26.2). The section would then end by looking forward to Germanicus' own assumption of the title—he would be the *heres* of 615; see Herbert-Brown (1994) 196ff. I take *hic* to refer to Octavian, thus preserving

a conscious structure to the eulogy. However, I mark a change of focus from Augustus to Tiberius/Germanicus in 613, such that Germanicus becomes the sustained focus of attention in this section; for the proposed structure of this section, see 593–616 (i) n.

A connection between the human ruler on earth and Jupiter, his counterpart in heaven, is first forged for the Hellenistic kings; it subsequently becomes a popular mode of flattery to Augustus and his imperial successors; cf. e.g. 2.131–2 *hoc tu per terras, quod in aethere Iuppiter alto,/nomen habes: hominum tu pater, ille deum*, *Met.* 15.858–60, Hor. *Carm.* 1.12.50 with Nisbet/Hubbard ad loc., 3.5.1–3 *caelo tonantem credidimus Iovem/regnare: praesens divus habebitur/Augustus*, Plin. *Pan.* 80.3–4, 88.8, Scott (1930) 52–8; for Ovid's bold extension of the motif, see 650n.

socium: for *socius* in the sense 'shared', cf. e.g. *Am.* 1.10.36, Prop. 1.5.29, Stat. *Silv.* 1.6.48 *nobiscum socias dapes inisti.*

609–10 "Our fathers call sacred things *august*, and *august* too are the temples which have been duly dedicated by the priests' hand": in drawing attention to the holy nature of the title 'Augustus', Ovid alludes to the principal reasoning on which the senatorial decision was based; cf. Suet. *Aug.* 7.2 *Augustus potius vocaretur . . . quod loca quoque religiosa et in quibus augurato quid consecratur augusta dicantur*, Dio 53.16.8; cf. also Serv. *A.* 7.153.

610 rite: the dedication ritual involved the pontiff's laying his hand on the door of the temple and uttering a religious formula; cf. Cic. *Dom.* 119ff.

611–12 Ovid asserts here that there is a common root which links *augurium* and *augustus*. The root to which he refers is probably **aug-* 'to increase', as he uses the verb in close proximity (612 *auget*). If **aug-* is the intended root, Ovid is the first extant author to promote such a root for both words; see 611n.

611 huius et augurium dependet origine verbi "Augury (*augurium*) too is derived from the root of this word (sc. *augustus*)": the two terms have a common root, **aug-* 'to increase' (see 611–12n.). In the case of *augurium*, although no ancient sources specify an etymological link with **aug-*—preferring instead a link with *avis* (see Maltby 65–6 s.v.)—modern scholars suggest that the etymological link is valid, either because augury ensures the success or *increase* of a particular enterprise, or because a human conducting augury is seeking from the gods a temporarily *increased* potency; see Ernout/Meillet

(1967) 56–7 s.v. '*augeo*', Dumézil (1970) 118–19, Skutsch (1985) 223–4; see esp. G. Dumézil (1957), "Remarques sur *Augur, Augustus*", *REL* 35, 126–51.

Ovid's allied assertion here—that there is a connection between *augustus* and *augurium*—is well-established and made famously by Ennius; cf. *Ann.* fr. 155 Sk. *augusto augurio postquam incluta condita Roma est.* As with *augurium*, two etymological branches are entertained for *augustus*. Some agree with Ovid that *augustus* derives from *augeo*; cf. Suet. *Aug.* 7.2 *quod loca quoque religiosa et in quibus augurato quid consecratur augusta dicantur, ab auctu.* Others assert that *augustus*, like *augurium*, derives from *avis*; cf. Suet. *Aug.* 7.2 *ab avium gestu gustuve*, Fest. 2 L.

dependet "is derived from": Ovid is the first to use *dependeo* (lit. 'hang down') in the metaphorical sense to express word derivation; cf. Fest. 77 L. *famuli origo ab Oscis dependit*, *Thes.* 5.1.568.60ff.

612 et quodcumque sua Iuppiter auget ope "and all such augmentation as Jupiter grants by his power" (Frazer): following on from 611, it seems that Ovid is suggesting that something else (a noun) has **aug* as its root, but it is not at all clear what this might be. Ovid may be thinking of *auctus* ('increase') or possibly *auctoritas*, which is literally thought to be 'the result of increasing' (Ernout/Meillet (1967) 57)).

613–16 The focus turns now to Tiberius and his heir (see 593–616 (i) n.). Continuity of thought is maintained by the anaphora of *augeat* (613), which keeps the etymological focus.

613 augeat imperium nostri ducis "may the power of our leader increase": Ovid appeals to Jupiter (from 612) to increase the Emperor's *imperium*. *imperium* is a notoriously elusive term, whose meaning seems to undergo a development, in the first centuries B.C and A.D., from 'supreme administrative power' (*OLD* s.v. 1) to a physically-defined 'empire' (*OLD* s.v. 6); see esp. J. Richardson (1991), "*Imperium Romanum*: Empire and the Language of Power", *JRS* 81, 1–9. Translating *imperium* as 'empire' would here create an ironic prayer from Ovid, given the late-Augustan rhetoric of non-expansion of the empire (see 713–14n.); it may be preferable, for this reason, to translate *imperium* in its original sense.

The subject of *ducis* is probably Tiberius; see 593–616 (i) n., 608n. *dux* is a complimentary though not necessarily deferential address. It is a semi-official title of the Emperor Augustus—cf. e.g. *Ars* 3.391, Hor. *Carm.* 1.2.52 with Nisbet/Hubbard ad loc., *Thes.* 5.1.2324.51ff.—and is particularly common in addresses to Tiberius; cf. 646 *dux*

venerande with Bömer ad loc., *Tr.* 3.12.48, 4.2.44, *Pont.* 2.1.22, Suet. *Tib.* 21.4, Zanker (1988) 227ff., Dickey (2002) 108.

augeat annos: this particular formula, whereby Jupiter is urged to give long life to the Emperor, is first found here in extant sources, but is a feature of (later) inscriptions; cf. *CIL* 6.1.2086.17, 2104b.36 *saepe de nostr(is) ann(is) augeat tibi (I)up(piter) (annos)* (to the Emperor M. Aurelius, A.D. 218), *Thes.* 2.1345.71ff.

614 protegat et vestras querna corona fores "may an oaken crown protect your doors as well": as a result of the meeting on 13th January 27 B.C., the Senate decreed that laurel boughs/bushes be placed in front of Octavian's doorposts and an oaken crown fastened on the door itself; cf. 4.953–4, *Met.* 1.562–3, Aug. *RG* 34 *quo pro merito meo senatus consulto . . . laureis postes aedium mearum velati publice coronaque civica super ianuam meam fixa est,* Dio 53.16.4, Lacey (1996) 80–3. This crown, a military prize traditionally awarded for saving lives in battle (Sen. *Cl.* 1.26.5, Plin. *Nat.* 16.7ff., Gel. 5.6.11), was apparently awarded to Augustus for saving the citizens, and features on many coins of the era; cf. *Tr.* 3.1.47–8 *causa superpositae scripto testata coronae/servatos cives indicat huius ope,* Zanker (1988) 93–4.

vestras is ambiguous. If *dux* (613) is taken to refer to Augustus, then *vestras* refers to Augustus and Tiberius. But it may be better to the overall design of the section to take *dux* as a reference to Tiberius, making *vestras* refer to Tiberius and Germanicus; see 593–616 (i) n., 608n. The word order of the couplet encourages the latter interpretation. The postponed *et* in 614 is best taken with *vestras*; Ovid is therefore hoping that Tiberius and Germanicus *also*—i.e. just like Augustus before them—will accept the civic crown. On becoming Emperor, Tiberius apparently refuses the honour for some time (cf. Suet. *Tib.* 26), and it may be to this reluctance to take the crown that Ovid appeals here.

615–16 "With the gods favourable, may the heir of so great a title receive the burden of the world with the same omen with which his father took it up": the heir is probably Germanicus, the father Tiberius; see 593–616 (i) n., 608n. As such, Ovid is fulfilling his initial promise to Germanicus (10) that he would have the opportunity to read about his father and grandfather (see also 590n.).

615 auspicibusque deis: *auspex*, literally a person who watches the birds, here takes the transferred sense 'one who brings good favour', and is commonly found as an epithet for gods; cf. 4.830, Verg. *A.* 3.20, 4.45–6 *dis equidem auspicibus reor . . . /hunc cursum Iliacas*

vento tenuisse carinas (Anna to Dido), Avien. *Arat.* 1, *Thes.* 2.1541.57ff.

616 orbis onus: empire is often referred to as a burden to be shouldered; see 534n. The specific phrase here, however, has the effect of casting the Emperor in the role of Atlas, who traditionally shoulders the globe; for this flattering image (used subtly of Aeneas when he lifts up his cosmic shield), see Hardie (1986) 369–76.

617–36 15th January Carmentalia II

617 respiciet Titan actas ubi tertius Idus "When the third sun shall look back on the Ides gone past": Ovid refers to 15th January, three days after the Ides on 13th (inclusive counting). The Sun god was popularly identified either with Hyperion, one of the Titans, or with Hyperion's son; see 385n. For this reason, *Titan* becomes a recognised name for the Sun, going back to at least Cic. *Arat.* 589, and is used by Ovid to give learned variety to his chronological references; cf. 2.73 *proximus Hesperias Titan abiturus in undas*, 4.180.

618 Parrhasiae sacra relata deae: the Parrhasian goddess is Carmentis; for the epithet, see 478n. The festival is 'brought back' in the sense that this is the second (non-consecutive) day of the Carmentalia; cf. 461–586 (11th January).

619 nam prius Ausonias matres carpenta vehebant: during the Romans' siege of Veii in the fourth century B.C., Camillus vowed to dedicate a tenth of the spoils to Apollo should he capture the city. Following its capture in 396 B.C., Camillus found that funds had run short when it came to rewarding Apollo, and he was only saved from this predicament by the Roman matrons, who voluntarily handed over their gold possessions to make up the due amount. As a mark of gratitude, the Senate decreed that women have the right to travel in four-wheeled carriages (*pilenta*) to games and festivals, and two-wheeled carriages (*carpenta*) on holy and working days; cf. Liv. 5.25.8ff., Fest. 282 L. s.v. '*pilentis*'. This special female privilege is memorialised on the shield of Aeneas at Verg. *A.* 8.665–6. For the epithet *Ausonius*, see 55n.

620 haec quoque ab Euandri dicta parente reor "these things also, I believe, were named after Evander's parent": the implication made here is that *carpenta* takes its name from Carmentis (Carmenta), Evander's mother, though it is not clear whether Ovid means before or after the women's successful campaign for the reinstatement of

their privilege to ride in carriages (see 621–8n.). Ovid is here applying one of the four standard techniques for etymologising, namely *immutatio* (the changing of letters, in this case 'm' for 'p'); cf. 5.195–6 (Chloris to Flora), 481–4 (Remuria to Lemuria), 535–6 *hunc Hyrieus, quia sic genitus, vocat Uriona:/perdidit antiquum littera prima sonum*; for the etymologising techniques, see 325–6n.

This etymology is far-fetched and unparalleled (see Maltby ad loc.). Nevertheless, the connection between *carpenta* and Carmentis forged here, softened perhaps by the candid admission that it is only Ovid's opinion (*reor*), must be acknowledged as an ingenious ploy on the part of the poet. It affords Ovid an opportunity to tell/fabricate a story (see 621–8 (i) n.) which incorporates two important features of Carmentis and her festival which have not yet been handled: her presidency over childbirth and the reason why her festival lasts two days (see 627–8n.). Once again, it would seem, etymologising is revealed as a practice which can be manipulated to fit a poetic agenda; for another example of this, see 319–32n.

quoque here is intriguing, as it suggests that there has been something mentioned previously which takes its name from Carmentis. At 467–8, however, the only other occasion on which Ovid deals with etymology concerning Carmentis, we are expressly told that Carmentis takes her name from *carmen*, and not the other way round.

621–8 Ovid proceeds to tell of the women's radical measures for change when their rights of carriage were removed. Every matron resolved not to give birth (621–2), and those that were pregnant aborted the foetus themselves (623–4). Though the Senate reprimanded these actions, they restored the honour to the women (625–6), and set up a second day of rites to Carmentis to promote the birth of boys and girls respectively (627–8).

i. *Creative History*

By *honor eripitur* (621), Ovid alludes to the loss of female privileges—among them the right to ride in carriages—which came into force with the Lex Oppia of 215 B.C. According to Livy 34.1–8, our only detailed source for this period, a debate was held in 195 B.C. to put forward the cases for and against a repeal of the Lex Oppia: Marcus Cato argued for the upholding of the law, and Lucius Valerius

for its abolition. The Roman women themselves played a significant but largely peaceful role in the affair, crowding the streets to voice their views (34.1.5–6) and besieging the houses of those who threatened to vote against their interests (34.8.1–2). The law was eventually repealed, twenty years after its institution (34.8.3). Ovid shares with Livy the united front shown by the Roman women but, in a startling twist, replaces peaceful protest with abstinence from childbirth and abortion: the women thus pose such a demographic threat to the future of Rome that the ruling class have little choice but to abolish the law.

This version of events is not found before Ovid, and only subsequently, in summary, at Plu. *Mor.* 278b–d. Assuming that Livy's account is broadly accurate, Ovid's version is, in all likelihood, a creative aetiology which is only loosely attached to historical event; for this narrative strategy in *Fasti*, see Porte (1985) 378–88 esp. 378–81. First, there is a problem with chronology. According to Livy, there was a twenty year period between the abolition of women's rights under the Lex Oppia in 215 B.C. and the reinstatement of those rights in 195 B.C. But this twenty year period hardly fits Ovid's version of the story: the real demographic threat, seemingly posed by the women the moment the ban was enforced (621), would surely have prompted a much swifter reconciliation. Secondly, the suggestion that the second day of rites to Carmentis was only instituted following a successful repeal of the law conflicts with other accounts that suggest that the second day of rites goes back to Romulus; see 627–8 with n.

The result is a dramatic piece of creative history which might recall Aristophanes' comedy, *Lysistrata*, in which a similarly united female front uses its powers to force change: in this instance, they refuse sexual contact with their husbands, which forces an end to the war.

ii. *Childlessness, Abortion and Augustan Politics*

The women's refusal to bear children, even if it means taking the drastic measure of self-abortion, would have provoked some strong reaction in Augustan Rome. Abortion was legal in the ancient world until the early third century A.D., but that had never stopped it from being a controversial issue, on either moral (killing a living being) or legalistic grounds (denying someone a chance of an inher-

itance); see, in general, Kapparis (2002) 33–52, 167–94. This issue must have become particularly heated in Augustan times, where it would have jarred considerably with the Emperor's legislation on the family—*lex Iulia de maritandis ordinibus* (c. 18 B.C.)—which was designed to promote the birth-rate, particularly among the senatorial and equestrian orders; see Kapparis (2002) 148–51.

Of all the Augustan writers, however, Ovid is the only one to deal with the controversial issue of abortion, both cursorily—cf. Canace's failed self-abortion at *Her.* 11.41–2 and the disgust at Eubius' writings on abortion at *Tr.* 2.415–16—and in detail, when, at *Am.* 2.13 and 14, he puts forward several arguments against abortion during his chastisement of Corinna for her attempt (see below). In fact, Ovid may have taken the idea for this story from *Am.* 2.14 where, during his rebuke of Corinna, he imagines the demographic and historical consequence if women of antiquity had acted in a similar manner; cf. *Am.* 2.14.9–10 *si mos antiquis placuisset matribus idem,/gens hominum vitio deperitura fuit.*

So how does Ovid handle the controversial issue of abortion? It has been effectively argued that, in *Am.* 2.14, Ovid plays the role of *curator morum et legum*—perhaps even Augustus himself—in his fierce criticism of abortion on grounds that it is unnatural, murderous and a demographic threat; see Gamel (1989) 189–97. In the present story, Ovid appears, at first glance, to adopt a similarly critical (Augustan) stance. In 623–4, he reprimands the women for their recklessness (*temeraria*), draws attention to the violence involved in self-abortion (*excutiebat* with n.) and reminds us that the expelled foetus was in fact a living entity (*crescens* with n.). This critical stance is perhaps enhanced by the scathing assonance of 's' and 'c' in 624: *visceribus crescens excutiebat onus*. But this may not be the full picture. Ovid is equally keen to impress upon us the 'violence' of the male ruling class which brought about the women's drastic action in the first place: their privilege was 'snatched away' (621 *eripitur*), and they are subsequently 'snatched up together' (625 *corripuisse*). Moreover, given that both verbs are cognates of *rapio*, these phrases might be read to connote sexual violation: cannot *honor eripitur* (621) also mean 'their honour was (sexually) violated', and *corripuisse patres* (625) 'the senate (their fathers?) raped them together'? However we read these lines, the violence attributed to both parties, coupled with the fact that the women eventually achieve the reinstatement of their privileges, have the effect of blurring the distinctions between right and wrong.

Ovid has, in effect, invented a story which is a worrying affront to the Augustan legislation: a united female front uses its gender powers against the male ruling class, and is ultimately rewarded for its controversial actions. The women's actions are particularly unsettling in light of the previous section (587–616 esp. 611–16) which celebrated Augustus' association with increase and productivity; for readings of the complex interplay between these episodes, see Barchiesi (1997) 92–9, Pasco-Pranger (2002) 265–7.

621 mox honor eripitur: the women's privilege to ride in carriages was removed under the Lex Oppia in 215 B.C., during the financially hard times of the Second Punic war; cf. Liv. 34.1–8 esp. 5.5. *eripio* can be used with abstract objects, in which case it takes the less vivid sense 'take away suddenly' (*OLD* s.v. 4, *Thes.* 5.2.790.64ff.). However, the violence implicit in *eripitur* should not be so easily dismissed; see 621–8 (ii) n.

621–2 matronaque destinat omnis/ingratos nulla prole novare viros "every matron resolved to propagate the line of their ungrateful husbands with no new offspring": the choice of words here reflects the perception of the aggrieved women. First, it is from the women's viewpoint that the men are *ingratos*, as they have not shown gratitude for the women's former service of rescuing the state's finances by donating their gold; see 619n. Secondly, *novare* (**Aω**), a more difficult reading than *iuvare* (**Uζς**), is striking in that it is not elsewhere used of human birth; for its usage to describe the generation of animals/livestock, cf. Lucr. 2.75, Stat. *Theb.* 10.229 (cattle). To describe childbirth as a 'replenishing of stock' seems a particularly crude and functional move, and might reflect the women's own embitterment: they feel that they are being depersonalised as propagating machines.

623–4 "and so that she might not give birth, she rashly shook out the growing burden from her flesh with a blind thrust": as proper medical advice was not always available to women, either because of social class or a desire for secrecy, self-abortion was a risky but common practice in ancient times, by means of either a herbal drug (cf. e.g. *Her.* 11.41, *Am.* 2.14.28, Cic. *Clu.* 32) or, as suggested here, some type of crude implement; cf. *Am.* 2.14.1–4 *quid iuvat immunes . . . puellas . . . si sine Marte suis patiuntur vulnera telis/et caecas armant in sua fata manus?*, 27, 33–4; see, in general, Kapparis (2002) 7–31. The language used here is particularly vivid, and suggests a military onslaught (see 623n.).

623 daret partus: a variation on the more common idiom for giving birth, *partu do/edo*; cf. e.g. 2.383–4 *Silvia Vestalis caelestia semina partu/ediderat*, *Met.* 4.209–10, Verg. *A.* 1.274 *geminam partu dabit Ilia prolem.* This idiom, first found in Ovid, is rare elsewhere; cf. Claud. *Carm.* 53.56, *Thes.* 5.1.1686.66ff.

ictu . . . caeco: *caecus* may mean 'blind' in the sense 'blind to reason/foolish' and, along with *temeraria* (623), reinforce the sense of recklessness on the part of the women; cf. *Am.* 2.14.4 *et caecas armant in sua fata manus* (abortion) with McKeown ad loc. But the specific phrase here is typically found in military contexts, where it describes a blow received from an unknown enemy source; cf. Liv. 34.14.11 *non caecis ictibus procul ex improviso volnerabantur, sed pede conlato tota in virtute ac viribus spes erat*, 34.39.6, Sil. 9.105. Ovid's transferal of this military phrase to the context of abortion is shocking, and has the effect of casting the foetus in the role of battle victim that does not see the blow that is coming to him; for similar military overtones to abortion employed by Ovid, cf. *Her.* 11.45–6 *a, nimium vivax admotis restitit infans/artibus et tecto tutus ab hoste fuit* with Reeson ad loc. (Canace's foetus as siege victim), *Am.* 2.14.1–4.

temeraria: used regularly by Ovid but rarely by other Augustan poets (for statistics, see McKeown on *Am.* 1.7.3), this term often conveys an offence against a deity; cf. e.g. *Pont.* 2.2.13–14 *nec, quod Tydidae temeraria dextera fecit,/numina sunt telis ulla petita meis*, Ter. *An.* 229, Fest. 501 L. *temerare violare sacra et contaminare, dictum videlicet a temeritate.* Its usage here may suggest that the women's action is a direct violation of the deities of childbirth, and may help anticipate the later recompense, made to Carmentis, in the form of another day of rites.

624 Abortion is described in exactly the same graphic manner at *Her.* 11.43–4: *ut penitus nostris . . ./visceribus crescens excuteretur onus* (Canace).

visceribus: in the sense 'womb'; cf. *Her.* 11.44, *Am.* 2.14.27 with McKeown ad loc., Sen. *Dial.* 12.16.3.

crescens: Ovid strikes a further note of criticism against abortion by drawing attention to the foetus' status as a living being; for the ancient recognition of the living foetus, going back to Hippocratic medicine, see Kapparis (2002) 44–52.

excutiebat: *excutio* may be the technical verb for the aborting of a foetus; cf. Cels. 2.7.16 *mulieri gravidae sine modo fusa alvus excutere partum potest*, Scrib. Larg. *Praef.* 5, *Thes.* 5.2.1309.48–50.

onus, a means of referring to the foetus essentially from the

woman's viewpoint, is found first and regularly in Ovid, but rarely elsewhere; cf. 2.452 *maturumque utero molliter aufer onus* (prayer to Lucina), *Her.* 4.58, 6.120, 11.40, *Am.* 2.13.1, 20, *Met.* 10.481, *Thes.* 9.2.646.1ff.

625 corripuisse: literally 'snatch up/seize hold of', the verb can take the metaphorical sense 'rebuke'; cf. 6.606, *Her.* 19.21–2 *odioso concita vento/corripio verbis aequora paene tuis* (Hero to Leander), *Met.* 3.565, *Pont.* 2.6.5, Hor. *S.* 2.3.257, Liv. 2.28.5, *Thes.* 4.1045.9ff. Given the emphasis on violence in this section, however, the more literal rendering should be given careful consideration; see 621–8 (ii) n.

immitia: from the viewpoint of male ruling class.

626 ius tamen exemptum restituisse ferunt "they say that the Senate nevertheless restored the right which had been taken away": according to Livy (34.1–8), the reinstatement of the women's privileges occurred in 195 B.C., twenty years after the Lex Oppia had removed them. But this chronology hardly fits the drastic situation as presented in 621–4; see 621–8 (i) n.

627–8 "and (the Senate) ordered that now two festivals be held alike for the Tegean mother, for the sake of boys and girls": that Carmentis' festival is for boys and girls highlights the goddess' associations with childbirth, which is recognised from at least the time of Varro; cf. Var. *Ant.* fr. 103 Card., Plu. *Rom.* 21.2. Ovid suggests that the Senate (implied from 625) instituted the second day; in the parallel story at Plu. *Mor.* 278b–d, it is the women themselves. Both differ radically from other sources, which suggest that the second day of rites to Carmentis was instituted at a much earlier date by Romulus; cf. *Fasti Praenestini* (Degrassi 113), Plu. *Rom.* 21.2; see also 621–8 (i) n.

627 Tegeaeae: for the epithet, see 545n.

628 virginibusque: see 629n.

629 scortea: animal hide/leather was barred from the precincts of several shrines so as to avoid the pollution of death; cf. Var. *L.* 7.84 *in aliquot sacris ac sacellis scriptum habemus: 'ne quod scorteum adhibeatur', ideo ne morticinum quid adsit.* This ban is, of course, particularly appropriate to the shrine of a goddess of childbirth; cf. *Fasti Praenestini* (Degrassi 113) *Carmentis partus curat omniaque (f)utura, ob quam ca(ussam in aede eius cavetur ab scorteis omnique) omine morticino.*

scorteum ('hide/leather') was popularly believed to be connected etymologically with *scortum* ('prostitute'); cf. Var. *L.* 7.84 *scortari est saepius meretriculam ducere, quae dicta a pelle*, Fest. 330 L., Maltby 552 s.v.; cf.

also the jingle at Apul. *Met.* 1.8: *qui voluptatem Veneriam et scortum scorteum Lari et liberis praetulisti.* In light of this, there may be some intended word play with *virginibus* in the previous line (628): as the shrine is for 'virgins', is it not appropriate that 'tarts' (or 'tarty things' (neuter plural)) be excluded?

sacello: the shrine of Carmentis was situated between the Capitol and the Tiber, near the Porta Carmentalis. It is referred to elsewhere as a *sacellum* (Fest. 450 L.), but also as a *fanum* (Gel. 18.7.2) and an *ara* (Verg. *A.* 8.337, Gel. 16.16.4 (two altars)); see Platner/Ashby 101, Steinby I.240–1.

630 exanimata: the past participle of *exanimo* (lit. 'deprived of breath') comes to take on the specific meaning 'dead' first in Lucretius; cf. Lucr. 6.1256–7 *exanimis pueris super exanimata parentum/corpora non numquam posses . . . videre* (death by disease), Ov. *Met.* 2.268, *Thes.* 5.2.1176.50ff. It is here used as the substantive: 'dead things' (neuter plural).

631 siquis amas veteres ritus "if any one of you has a love of ancient rites": the poet offers advice to the avid antiquarian enthusiasts in his audience, and by his subsequent observations, suggests that he too is such an enthusiast. The author of an antiquarian work is naturally expected to project a particular fondness of old customs, and Ovid's sense of enthusiasm in *Fasti* is enhanced by such claims as looking at old annals/calendars (1.7, 289, 3.87–96, 4.11, 6.57–64), personally visiting a place or festival about which he speaks (cf. e.g. 1.389, 3.274, 6.237–8) or, whilst on a journey, stopping to satisfy his curiosity by asking someone about a local custom (cf. e.g. 4.679ff., 905ff., 6.395ff.). Such displays of enthusiasm are a feature of his predecessors in the aetiological field; cf. e.g. Call. *Aet.* fr. 43.84–5 Pf. (see 165n.), Prop. 4.8.3–4 *Lanuvium annosi vetus et tutela draconis,/hic ubi tam rarae non perit hora morae* (local place worth a visit). It is also worth noting though that, in the case of Ovid, the same love of old customs is expressed outside the confines of *Fasti*; cf. *Am.* 3.13.3–5 *casta sacerdotes Iunoni festa parabant/et celebres ludos indigenamque bovem./grande morae pretium ritus cognoscere* (Ovid revels in a rite to Juno at Falerii).

633–6 Ovid proceeds to inform us that two entities are placated at the rites of Carmentis, Porrima and Postverta, who may be sisters or exile companions of the goddess (633–4). In 635–6, Ovid conjectures that Porrima is so named for her ability to sing of what happened long ago (*porro*), Postverta for singing what will come to pass (*venturum postmodo*). The same names are later associated with

Carmentis for the same reasons by Servius; cf. Serv. *A.* 8.336 *alii huius comites Porrimam et Postvertam tradunt, quia vatibus et praeterita et futura sunt nota*; see also Macr. 1.7.20, where the same reasons are given for the names *Antevorta* and *Postvorta,* alleged companions of Janus. On the other hand, Varro apparently attributed these cult names to Carmentis' role in childbirth rather than prophesy. The two names (with slight variation) represent the two ways in which a child can be born into the world, either feet first (considered backwards, increasing the mother's labour), or head first (considered forwards and natural); cf. Var. *Ant.* fr. 103 Card. *altera Postverta cognominata est, Prorsa altera, a recti perversique partus et potestate et nomine,* Tert. *Nat.* 2.11.6.

Ovid has thus far carefully structured his two Carmentalia entries, such that 11th January deals exclusively with the goddess' role as giver of prophecy (initiated by the etymology from *carmen* in 467), and 15th January with her associations with childbirth. In light of this, it is intriguing that Ovid should conclude this section with explanations for Porrima and Postverta which revert back to her prophetic connections, when the Varronian interpretation would have enhanced the focus on childbirth.

634 fugae . . . tuae: referring to Carmentis' forced exile with her son Evander; see 469–542 (i) n.

Maenali diva "goddess of Maenalus": Maenalus, a range of mountains in Arcadia, became a popular metonym for Arcadia itself; cf. 2.192, 3.84, 5.89 with Bömer ad loc., *Ars* 1.271–2 *prius . . . Maenalius lepori det sua terga canis,* Verg. *Ecl.* 8.21.

635 porro is often used in a temporal sense to denote some time in the distant future; cf. e.g. Liv. 40.36.1 *neque se neque quemquam alium divinare posse, quid in animo Celtiberi haberent aut porro habituri essent,* Cic. *Att.* 12.6. Here, however, *porro* (together with a pluperfect, *fuerat*) must mean 'in the distant past', an apparently unique usage; see Lewis/Short s.v. II A.1, *OLD* s.v. 2b.

putatur helps to establish the objective tone appropriate for didactic discourse; see 469n.

637–50 16th January Tiberius' dedication of a temple to Concord

Ovid duly notes the completion of Tiberius' restoration on a temple to Concord, which occurred on 16th January, A.D. 10; cf. Fasti Praenestini (Degrassi 115) *Concordiae Au(gustae aedis dedicat)a est P. Dolabella,*

C. Silano co(nsulibus). Ti. Caesar ex Pa(nnonia reversus dedic)avit, Fasti Verulani (Degrassi 161), Dio 56.25.1, Suet. *Tib.* 20 (though the year is given erroneously as A.D. 12). Ovid's entry takes the form of a favourable comparison. After a brief invocation to the goddess Concord herself, celebrating her renewed recognition (637–40), Ovid alludes, in negative fashion, to the situation which led to the building of the first (alleged) Temple to Concord by M. Furius Camillus in 367 B.C. (641–4); this is followed by a positive endorsement of the situation which led to the Tiberian dedication (645–8).

i. *Political* Concordia: *A Dynamic Slogan*

It is perhaps not surprising, if no less ironic, that political *concordia* should only have been championed in the midst of genuine threats of *discordia.* But the concept itself was dynamic and came to symbolise, through time, different types of harmonisation; see below and, in general, Levick (1978). Although it appears that there were many edifices constructed to Concord prior to Tiberius'—for a detailed list, see Simpson (1991) 451 n. 7—Ovid focuses on just one, namely that of M. Furius Camillus. Ovid's comparison of the two temples bears witness to the changing role of political *Concordia*; see, in general, Herbert-Brown (1994) 162–7, Pasco-Pranger (2002a) 267–70.

The dedication of a temple to Concord by M. Furius Camillus is now generally agreed to be fictitious, a later (post-Gracchan) addition to the Camillus story; see Momigliano (1942a), Levick (1978) 219–20. Nevertheless, the 'tradition' that Ovid follows here seems to be as follows. The Plebeians were pressurising the Patricians to ratify the Licinio-Sextian laws, which would allow them, for the first time, to hold the consulship; fearing that the situation was out of control, Camillus vowed a temple to Concord on condition that the struggle ended; the laws were eventually conceded to the Plebeians and a temple to Concord duly built in 367 B.C.; cf. Liv. 6.42.9–14 (the reconciliation is mentioned, but no temple), Plu. *Cam.* 42. Working on the basis that the temple did exist, as Ovid does in this section, the Camillan dedication would have symbolised a *concordia ordinum*, a reconciliation between Plebeians and Patricians, even though it amounted to, in effect, a Plebeian victory.

By contrast, in A.D. 10, Tiberius had finished restoration on a previous temple of Concord—widely believed to be the one originally built by L. Opimius in 121 B.C.—and had renamed it Augustan Concord;

see Levick (1978) 224–5, Steinby I.317–18. The Tiberian temple potentially symbolised two kinds of *concordia*. Most obviously, it symbolised harmony on a military front. As Ovid intimates in 645–8, Tiberius (in his own name and that of his dead brother Drusus) had pledged a temple to Concord on 1st January 7 B.C., following his victory over the German tribes west of the Elbe. The parameters of *concordia* have thus been extended beyond the immediate political situation at Rome to symbolise the harmony of the (conquered) Empire.

More subtly, however, the temple symbolised harmony on a familial front. The seventeen year gap between vow (7 B.C.) and dedication (A.D. 10) is symptomatic of a turbulent intervening period, especially for Tiberius, who spent the time either in exile, on campaign or contending with dynastic strife; it is only from A.D. 9 onwards that Tiberius is firmly and safely established in Rome as Augustus' heir. The temple was set up, therefore, with the intention of promoting a sense of (long-overdue) harmony within the imperial family. The date of the dedication—different from that of previous temples to Concord (some point in late July)—was cleverly chosen to point up dynastic connections: this was the date, in 27 B.C., on which Octavian had received the title of Augustus from the Senate (though not according to Ovid: see 590n.). Moreover, the extravagant sculptural display of the temple was chosen by different members of the imperial family and reflected the harmony amongst their number; see Kellum (1990).

The two temples to Concord, then, are the result of two completely different situations, and Ovid, in an overtly panegyric tone, gives his full backing to the Tiberian monument over that of Camillus. Following an opening in which he specifically celebrates the present—note the anaphora of *nunc* (639–40)—Ovid shows his disapproval of the civil discord which gave rise to the first temple; see 643–4 with nn. By contrast, the Tiberian temple, resulting from victory over foreign factions, is, for Ovid, a better reason for dedication to the goddess: *causa ... melior* (645). In taking this standpoint, Ovid not only praises the imperial family but also endorses Augustan ideology, which marked a strong distinction between civil war (disgraceful and illegitimate) and war against foreigners (justified); for the distinction, cf. e.g. Verg. *A.* 6.826–35, 851–3 (the conflict between Pompey and Caesar is condemned, whilst the crushing of foreign enemies is encouraged), Hor. *Carm.* 4.15, *Epod.* 7, Dio 50.4.4ff. (Octavian's decision to declare a 'foreign' war against Cleopatra,

rather than a 'civil' war against Antony); see also 644n. Furthermore, by associating Livia with this dedication in the final couplet (649–50), Ovid pays lip service to the important imperial, familial aspect to the temple; for the problems in interpreting these lines, see 649n.

ii. *A Late Entry*

As the temple was dedicated after A.D. 8, it follows that this entire section (637–50) was composed by the poet at some point during his exile, probably after the death of Augustus in A.D. 14. This suggestion has been prompted in particular by the curious mention of Livia in the final couplet (649–50), even though there is no evidence for her having played any part in the dedication; for the complexities of these lines, see 649n. It has been suggested that, written at a time after Augustus' death, the inclusion of Livia here creates a sense of harmony of partnership between Tiberius, the new Emperor, and his mother, Livia; see Herbert-Brown (1994) 167. This type of homage-paying to Livia, which has already been witnessed during Carmentis' prophesy (536), is further inspired by Ovid's hope that Livia had the influence to secure his release from exile; see 515–36 (iii) n.

637 candida, te niveo posuit lux proxima templo "Fair goddess, the next day placed you in a white temple": the fair goddess is Concord (639), on whose temple restoration was completed by Tiberius on 16th January A.D. 10 (see 637–50n.). The brilliance of its marble structure is hinted at by *niveo* ('snowy white'); for the use of *niveus* to describe marble, cf. e.g. *Met.* 14.313–14 *illa mihi niveo factum de marmore signum/ostendit iuvenale*, Verg. *A.* 3.126, André (1949) 340–1; for Augustan pride in the visual brilliance of the city, see 70n.

638 qua fert sublimes alta Moneta gradus "where lofty Moneta bears her steps high": the temple of Juno Moneta was situated on the citadel, the highest point of the Capitol; access to the temple was via a long staircase from the Forum; see Platner/Ashby 289–90, Steinby III.123ff. It was next to this staircase, on the high ground at the western end of the Forum, that the Tiberian temple to Concord stood; see Steinby I.316–18.

The phraseology here plays on two different meanings. Most naturally, perhaps, *gradus* can be taken as a concrete 'step/stair' (*OLD* s.v. 3); Ovid would therefore be making a comment about the

stairway leading up to the temple. However, given Ovid's tendency to personify the temples in this section (see 640n.), and given that *gradus ferre* is a recognised idiom for 'walking'—cf. e.g. 6.338, *Ars* 3.304, Pl. *Merc.* 882, *Thes.* 6.2.2147.27ff.—Ovid may be evoking an image of the goddess Moneta herself walking up to her temple.

639–40 nunc bene prospicies Latiam Concordia turbam/nunc te sacratae constituere manus "Now, Concord, will you command a wide view over the Roman throng; now consecrated hands have set you up": the order of thought here may not be chronological, but there is no need to alter the second *nunc* (640) which is attested in all the main MSS. The anaphora of *nunc* emphasises that it is to the most recent temple to Concord that Ovid's celebration will be directed. *prospicies* (**U**ζω) is a much better reading than *prospiciens* (**A**ς). First, a double proclamation (with two main verbs, *prospicies . . . constituere*) creates a more excited, celebratory tone. Secondly, the adoption of the present participle would make the first *nunc* (639) redundant.

639 Latiam . . . turbam: *turba* is an appropriate term to describe the hustle and bustle of the Roman Forum on to which the temple of Concord looks (see 638n.). A view over the Forum might well have been considered highly desirable for the gods, if we take into account the pride Vertumnus shows in the favourable location of his statue; cf. Prop. 4.2.5–6 *haec me turba iuvat, nec templo laetor eburno:/Romanum satis est posse videre Forum,* 55–6 *sed facias . . . /transeat ante meos turba togata pedes.* For *Latius* in the narrowed sense 'Roman', see 1n.

640 te . . . constituere: in one sense, this is a personified reference to Tiberius' establishing of the recent temple to Concord; for Ovid's predilection for personification in this section, cf. *Moneta* (638n.), *antiquam* (641n.), *Roma* (644), *Germania* (645). In another sense, the phrase may pay lip service to the *concordia* that Tiberius has 'established' on other (particularly familial) fronts; see 637–50 (i) n. For similar 'duality' of service to *concordia,* cf. 648 (Tiberius), 649n. (Livia).

sacratae . . . manus: a veiled reference to Tiberius, who is elsewhere in this section referred to by religious terminology; cf. *dux venerande* (646 with n.). If this is an indirect acknowledgement of Tiberius' position as Pontifex Maximus—assumed on 10th March A.D. 15 (*Fasti Praenestini, Fasti Vaticani* [Degrassi 121, 173])—it suggests that this section was composed very late during his exile.

641 antiquam: sc. *Concordiam,* a personified means of expressing *antiquum templum Concordiae*; see also 640n.

populi superator Etrusci "conqueror of Etruscan people": Camillus achieved military success over just one Etruscan city, Veii, in 396 B.C. after a ten year siege; cf. Liv. 5.21–2, Plu. *Cam.* 5.3ff. This grand phrase is, therefore, a flattering exaggeration, unless it means 'conqueror of *an* Etruscan people' (i.e. the Veientines). *superator* is first found in Ovid and only subsequently in much later authors; cf. *Met.* 4.699 *Gorgonis anguicomae Perseus superator* with Bömer ad loc., Fulgentius *Aet. Mund.* 4.15.

642 voti solverat ille fidem "he had fulfilled the pledge of his vow": for *solvo* in the sense of fulfilling a vow, cf. e.g. 5.596, *Met.* 9.708, Verg. *G.* 1.436 *votaque servati solvent in litore nautae*, Liv. 28.21.1, *OLD* s.v. 20, Lewis/Short s.v. 3c–d.

643–4 "The cause was that the rabble had taken up arms and had withdrawn from the Patricians, and Rome herself was afraid of her own might": Ovid refers in negative terms to the situation which led to Camillus' (alleged) foundation of the first temple to Concord; see 637–50 (i) n. The delayed *volgus* (see n.), emphatic by enjambment, is a surprise tactic, as we realise that the enemy attacking Rome is the Roman people itself. This train of thought is maintained by *ipsa suas Roma timebat opes* (see 644n.).

643 secesserat: the verb suggests that there was a *secessio plebis*, a formal withdrawal of the Plebeians from public life (originally a 'withdrawal of the people' to a hill outside the sacred boundary of the city: see *OCD* s.v.). Livy does not go as far as Ovid here, referring to the struggle as a 'near' secession; cf. Liv. 6.42.10 *prope secessionem plebis* with Oakley ad loc.

644 volgus, 'the common folk, rabble', is a more pejorative term than *plebs*; cf. e.g. Ter. *Hau.* 386, Cic. *Q. Rosc.* 29, Cat. 72.3, Hor. *Carm.* 3.1.1 *odi profanum vulgus et arceo.* It is therefore appropriate in the present context of condemnation (see 643–4n.).

ipsa suas Roma timebat opes: attention is drawn, particularly by means of the juxtaposition of *ipsa suas*, to the intrinsic irony and treachery of civil strife. This type of rhetoric for civil strife is employed elsewhere with varying degrees of vividness, particularly with reference to the Civil Wars involving Pompey and Caesar; cf. *Am.* 3.15.10 *cum timuit socias anxia Roma manus* (Social War, 90–89 B.C.), Verg. *A.* 6.832–3 *ne, pueri, ne tanta animis adsuescite bella/neu patriae validas in viscera vertite viris* (Anchises to Pompey and Caesar), Hor. *Epod.* 7.9–10, 16.2 *suis et ipsa Roma viribus ruit*, Luc. 1.2–3; for the general notion of a state toppled by its own power, see Mankin on Hor. *Epod.* 16.2.

The close proximity of *Roma* and *opes* may suggest subtle etymological play, given that the city's name is sometimes derived from ῥώμη ('might'); for the etymology, cf. Plu. *Rom.* 1.1, Fest. 328 L., Maltby 529–30 s.v.; for similar potential etymological play, cf. Verg. *A.* 6.870–1, 12.827 *Romana potens . . . propago* with O'Hara (1996) 291–2.

645 recens: i.e. relative to Camillus' temple: the occasion for Tiberius' temple, the defeat of the Germans, actually took place seventeen years before the dedication of the finished monument; see 637–50 (i) n.

645–6 passos Germania crines/porrigit "Germany extends her outstretched hair": the two (virtually synonymous) verbs here are more commonly found with *manus* to convey supplication and surrender; for *manus/palmas pando*, cf. Cic. *Sest.* 117, Lucr. 5.1200, *Thes.* 10.1.194.35ff.; for *manus porrigo*, cf. *Am.* 1.2.20 *porrigimus victas ad tua iura manus*, Petr. 111.10, *Thes.* 8.362.7ff. But in this instance, as elsewhere in Ovid, hair replaces hands when referring to victory over Germany; cf. *Tr.* 4.2.43–4 *crinibus en etiam fertur Germania passis,/et ducis invicti sub pede maesta sedet*, *Pont.* 3.4.107–8 *squalidus immissos fracta sub harundine crines/Rhenus et infectas sanguine portet aquas* (Rhine). Ovid may be playing on the fact that wigs made from German hair were popularly imported for use by Roman women; cf. *Am.* 1.14.45 *nunc tibi captivos mittet Germania crines* with McKeown ad loc., *Ars* 3.163–4, Mart. 5.37.7–8, 8.33.20. An image of Germany with outstretched hair, therefore, might constitute a particularly witty picture of submission.

646 auspiciis: as military leaders were the only individuals capable of taking the auspices, *auspicium* often takes the extended sense 'chief command'; cf. e.g. *Her.* 3.136 *sic eat auspiciis Pyrrhus ad arma tuis*, Hor. *Ep.* 2.1.254, Liv. 6.23.9, *Thes.* 2.1547.72ff.

dux venerande: for *dux* as a popular title for Tiberius, see 613n. *venerandus* is respectful and typically used in addresses to those with whom the relationship is formal; cf. e.g. Stat. *Theb.* 3.546, Sil. 6.424, Dickey (2002) 363.

647 triumphatae libasti munera gentis: as Ovid suggests, it was from the spoils of the conquered Germans that the reconstruction of the temple was financed; cf. Suet. *Tib.* 20. The *-que* of *templaque* (648) is, therefore, explicative; for other examples, see 446n.

triumphatae "made the occasion of a triumph" (*OLD* s.v. 3b): an allusion to the triumph Tiberius celebrated on 1st January 7 B.C. over the German tribes west of the Elbe; cf. Vell. 2.97.4, Dio 55.6.5, 55.8.1, Suet. *Tib.* 9.2.

648 templaque fecisti, quam colis ipse, deae: i.e. Tiberius has 'established' Concord both in the form of a temple and in his general conviction; for similar 'duality' of service to *concordia*, see 640n. A similar sentiment will be made in the next line about his mother, Livia (see 649n.).

649 hanc tua constituit genetrix et rebus et ara "Your mother established this goddess both by her life's achievements and by an altar": interpretation of this line is complicated by textual variants for the first word, *haec* (**AUω**) or *hanc* (ς). If the majority reading *haec* is adopted, which would refer back to *templa* (648), Ovid is suggesting that Livia had a hand in the dedication of the temple to Concord. This view has received some support. The dedication of a Roman temple was believed to have involved three separate stages, which could have occurred on different days: senatorial approval for the dedication, the inauguration (or re-inauguration) of the site, marked by the dedication of an altar, and finally the dedication of the finished construction (or reconstruction). It has been suggested that Livia may have taken part in the second of these stages, namely the re-inauguration of the site (perhaps as early as 7 B.C.), and that the *ara* in 649 refers specifically to the altar dedicated on that day as part of that re-inauguration; see Simpson (1991).

Others have dismissed the reading *haec* on the grounds that the temple's association with elite ideology would make implausible its connection with a woman; see Herbert-Brown (1994) 165 n.72. In adopting the alternative reading *hanc*, which would refer back to *deae* (648), we are presented in 649 with a general picture of Livia's affiliation with the goddess Concord, whom she has honoured in deeds (*rebus*) and by an altar (*ara*). *rebus* may allude to Livia's famous joint dedication (with Tiberius) of the Porticus Liviae on the Esquiline in 7 B.C., which symbolised harmony within the imperial family, particularly her marital harmony with Augustus; cf. Dio 55.8.2, Zanker (1988) 137ff. As for the *ara*, this may refer to the altar set up to Concord by Livia in the Porticus Liviae as a gift to her dear husband, which Ovid mentions elsewhere and for which there is good archaeological evidence; cf. 6.637–8 *te quoque magnifica, Concordia, dedicat aede/Livia, quam caro praestitit ipsa viro*, Flory (1984) 310.

If we adopt *hanc*, which would seem the more attractive option, it follows that Livia has been tacked on to a section and historical event to which she strictly does not belong. Ovid may have done this to forge a sense of *concordia* among the members of the imperial

family, particularly the post-Augustan relationship between the new Emperor and his mother; see 637–50 (ii) n.

649 constituit . . . et rebus et ara: for Ovid's fondness for syllepsis, see 597n.

genetrix, a term largely confined to elevated poetry (see 479n.), might, in the divine context, encourage a connection between Livia and Venus, the ultimate Roman *genetrix*; cf. e.g. *Tr.* 2.261, Enn. *Ann.* fr. 58 Sk., Lucr. 1.1–2 *Aeneadum genetrix, hominum divomque voluptas,/alma Venus.*

650 sola toro magni digna reperta Iovis "the woman who alone was found worthy of the marriage-bed of great Jupiter": Augustus is often represented as the earthly counterpart of Jupiter, ruler of heaven (see 608n.). More boldly, Augustus is occasionally identified specifically with Jupiter himself; by implication, Livia becomes equated with Juno; cf. e.g. *Pont.* 3.1.117 *mores Iunonis*, 145 *cum tibi contigerit vultum Iunonis adire* (instructions to his wife on meeting Livia), *Epic. Drusi* 380 *quodque etiam magno consociata Iovi* (Livia), Scott (1930) 52–8.

The sentiment here pays lip service to the much-vaunted public image of Livia as chaste and loyal wife to the Emperor; cf. e.g. 5.157–8, *Tr.* 1.6.25–7, *Pont.* 4.13.29 (Livia is the 'Vesta' of pure matrons), *Epic. Drusi* 41–2, Barrett (2002) 123ff. It may also provide a timely allusion to their wedding anniversary, recorded on the day after this entry, 17th January, 38 B.C.; cf. *Fasti Verulani* (Degrassi 161) *Feriae ex s(enatus) c(onsulto), quod eo die Augusta nupsit divo Aug(us)t(o).*

The specific detail here, however, is intriguing for its obvious factual inaccuracy: Livia was not the *only* wife of Augustus, as he had been married twice before (and she once before). In fact, the circumstances which brought about the marriage between Octavian and Livia were notorious. Octavian divorced his second wife, Scribonia, in 39 B.C., after just one year of marriage, and immediately after the birth of their daughter, Julia. Livia divorced her husband, Tiberius Nero, in the same year. Moreover, there were strong suggestions that the two were having an affair some time before these divorces; cf. Tac. *Ann.* 5.1, Suet. *Aug.* 69.1, Dio 48.34.3, Barrett (2002) 19–27.

In light of this, it is intriguing that Ovid on three occasions—and Horace once—should construct flattery based on this falsehood; cf. *Tr.* 2.161–4, *Pont.* 3.1.118 *sola est caelesti digna reperta toro*, Hor. *Carm.* 3.14.5 *unico gaudens mulier marito.* On the positive side, it may be an attempt to paper over the intrigues of the past and instead establish Livia as a *univira*; for this exalted Roman virtue, found especially on

epitaphs, cf. *Carm. Epigr.* 455 *solo contenta marito*, 643.5, 968.3, Prop. 4.11.36 (Cornelia), V. Max. 4.3.3 (Antonia); G. Williams (1958), "Some Aspects of Roman Marriage Ceremonies and Ideals", *JRS* 48, 23–4. On the negative side, it may be a subtle means of exposing the hypocrisy behind the public image of Livia; see Wiedemann (1975) 269, Newlands (1995) 44–5, Johnson (1997) 408ff., 415ff.

The latter interpretation might be more attractive if we take into account the potentially subversive connections between this couplet and the next, which notes the coming of the star-sign Aquarius (651–2). In 651, we find two terms juxtaposed which have strong Augustan connections: Phoebus, Augustus' patron deity, and Capricorn, his conception sign (see 651n.). Furthermore, in 652, Ovid identifies Aquarius with Ganymede (see 652n.), the young boy ravished by Jupiter in an act of infidelity which traditionally embitters his wife, Juno; cf. 6.43 *rapto Ganymede dolebam* (Juno), Verg. *A.* 1.28. It has been suggested that, as the connection between Augustus and Jupiter has just been made (*Iovis* (650)), recollection of a mythical character who incited infidelity in Jupiter might undermine the sense of Augustan marital fidelity evoked in 650; see Newlands (1995) 44–7. A similar juxtaposition of ideas, with the same potential tensions, occurs again at 2.127ff., where a eulogy to Augustus, the earthly Jupiter (2.131–2), as the reverend *Pater Patriae*, leads into an astronomical reference involving Ganymede (2.145–6); for differing readings of these adjacent episodes, see Harries (1989) 166–7, Barchiesi (1997) 80ff.

651–2 17th January Change of sign from Capricorn to Aquarius

651–2 On the day after the dedication of the temple to Concord, i.e. 17th January, Ovid marks the sun's passing from the sign of Capricorn into that of Aquarius. The same date for this transition is assigned by Pliny at *Nat.* 18.235. For the potentially subversive connections between this entry and the previous couplet, see 650n.

651 transierint: for the temporal sense of *transeo*, cf. e.g. 4.165 *nox ubi transierit*, Caes. *Gal.* 3.2.1, Verg. *A.* 1.266, Prop. 3.10.5, *OLD* s.v. 13b.

Capricorno: Capricorn, widely advertised as Augustus' conception-sign, became a powerful and dynamic symbol for the Emperor, especially on coins; see Barton (1995) 44–51, Gee (2000) 137–40. Though

contemporary poets are keen to draw attention to the connection between Augustus and Capricorn—cf. Man. 2.507–9, Germ. *Arat.* 558–60—Ovid makes little of it: he only alludes to it here by a juxtaposing of sign (651) and Emperor (650), which can itself be read subversively (see 650n.); later and more allusively, a connection is made between Jupiter and Capella at 5.111–14 (see Gee (2000) 133–53). Ovid's reticence in this area does, however, tie in with the marked absence of astrology elsewhere from the poem; see 295–310 (i) n.

652 iuvenis . . . signa regentis aquam: the young boy regulating the water (to mix with wine) is Ganymede, the Trojan adored by Jupiter and transported to the sky to act as his attendant; cf. e.g. Hom. *Il.* 5.265, 20.231ff. He is regularly identified with the water-carrier Aquarius; cf. 2.145–6 *iam puer Idaeus media tenus eminet alvo,/et liquidas mixto nectare fundit aquas*, Erat. *Catast.* 26, Hyg. *Astr.* 2.29 (among other identifications), Man. 4.709. As Ganymede's specific task was to mix the wine with the right amount of water—cf. Hyg. *Astron.* 2.29 *itaque ostenditur ut aquam aliquo infundens*—*regentis* ('regulating') offers a more precise image than the Heinsian conjecture *gerentis.*

curres: *curro* is the standard verb to express the course of the stars; cf. e.g. 3.111–12 *libera currebant et inobservata per annum/sidera*, Man. 2.245, *Aetna* 233. As in this example, the verb is particularly common in expressing the movement of the Sun, where it may allude to the Sun god's traditional mode of travel, the chariot (*currus*); cf. Lucr. 5.683, Man. 1.577ff., 4.852 *cum Phoebum adversis currentem non videt astris*, *Thes.* 4.1513.57ff.

653–4 23rd January Setting of the Lyre

653–4 Though Ovid here records the evening setting of the Lyre on seventh day after 17th—i.e. 23rd January by inclusive counting—he later apparently records the same event on 2nd February; cf. 2.75–6 *illa nocte aliquis, tollens ad sidera voltum,/dicet "ubi est hodie quae Lyra fulsit heri?"* This difference of opinion surrounding the setting of the Lyre is evident among other authors; cf. Plin. *Nat.* 18.235 (4th February), Col. 11.2.4, 5, 14 (four dates are given, 22nd and 30th January, 1st and 3rd February), *RE* 13.2495.1ff. It would appear that Ovid is here referring to the apparent setting of the constellation (though it may have actually occurred on 28th January), and the true setting at 2.75–6; see Ideler (1825) 145; for the progress of the Lyre through the year, see 315–16n.

653 Oriens, when short for *sol oriens*, can take the extended poetic meaning 'dawn, morning'; cf. Verg. *G.* 1.250, *A.* 5.42–3 *postera cum primo stellas Oriente fugarat/clara dies*, 739, V. Fl. 3.411 *ergo ubi puniceas oriens accenderit undas*, *Thes.* 9.2.1004.67ff. In this unparalleled instance, however, the meaning has been extended such that it takes on a strikingly paradoxical sense, describing the sun at the end of the day; for Ovid's keenness for innovation and variation in the chronological linkages in the poem, see also 461n.

demiserit undis: for the idea of setting constellations/Sun plunging into the sea, see 314n.

655–6 24th(?) January Setting of the Lion

655–6 "After this constellation, on the following night, the fire which gleams in the middle of the Lion's breast will have sunk": Ovid suggests that the constellation of the Lion sets in the evening of either 23rd or 24th January (see 655n.). He would appear to be noting, in fact, the *morning* setting of the constellation—Ideler (1825) 156 suggests that it occurred on 24th January—but there is no consensus among the ancient authors; cf. Plin. *Nat.* 18.235 (25th January), Col. 11.2.5 (27th January), *RE* 12.1981.5ff. As suggested here, the brightest star of the constellation—known as Regulus—was widely recognised as being located in the Lion's breast; cf. Hipparch. 2.5.7, Plin. *Nat.* 18.235 *in pectore leonis*, 18.271, Col. 11.2.5 *Leonis quae est in pectore clara stella occidit*, Kidd on Arat. 148.

655 venienti nocte: a dubious time reference. As the previous constellation, the Lyre, is believed to fall at sunset (653), the 'coming night' could mean either the nightfall on that day (23rd) or the nightfall on the following day (24th); for the general slipperiness of Ovid's time references, see 311–12n.

657–704 No fixed date Feriae Sementivae

i. *The Festival*

The *Sementiva dies* (658), more commonly known as the Feriae Sementivae, was a Roman agricultural festival, connected with sowing, which probably lasted for just one day (see 658n.). Despite the paucity of references in the ancient sources, certain features of the

festival are now generally agreed; see, in general, Le Bonniec (1958) 56–65. First, it seems to have taken place *after* the sowing had been completed: Ovid himself speaks of the seed already sown and the land teeming (*seminibus iactis est ubi fetus ager* (662), *semente peracta* (667)). This would place the festival at some point after mid December, the time which traditionally marked the end of the autumnal sowing; cf. Var. *R.* 1.34, Col. 2.8.2, 11.2.90, Spurr (1986) 42–3; for the controversy over which month hosted the festival, see (iii) below. As a post-sowing festival, the Feriae Sementivae served a prospective purpose, looking forward to the end of winter and the beginning of spring, and praying for good conditions for the growing crop to procure the best harvest; cf. Fest. 455 L. *Sementivae feriae fuerant institutae, quasi ex his fruges grandescere possint,* Le Bonniec (1958) 58–9. As such, the Feriae Sementivae formed the second part of a cycle of festivals in the Roman agricultural year designed to promote the well-being of the crop; see Le Bonniec (1958) 52–67, Harmon (1978) 1462–6.

ii. *Mimetic Representation and Literary Influence (663–96)*

Ovid's treatment of this festival falls into two parts. In 663–74, the poet bids that all things are in place for the festival, ending with a wish that Ceres and Tellus, the two mothers of the crop, be duly propitiated. From here, Ovid moves into a direct prayer to the two deities (675–94), in which he pays respect to their primary role in agriculture, and prays for fair conditions for the crop and the absence of any detrimental forces.

In effect, Ovid pretends that he is at the festival himself and, for the most part, plays the part of Master of Ceremony by giving the preparatory instructions and leading the prayer. This persona, with varying degrees of intensity, is adopted elsewhere by Ovid in his depiction of religious rites; cf. 719–22 (Ara Pacis), 2.623–38 (Caristia), 4.133–40 (bathing ceremony of Venus), 731–46 (Parilia), *Tr.* 5.5.1–12 (birthday rites). Vivid mimetic representations of religious rites are first found in Callimachus' *Hymns,* and find favour with Roman poets before Ovid; cf. Call. *Ap., Lav. Pall., Cer.,* Cat. 61 (marriage hymn), Prop. 4.6.1–14 (Actium), Tib. 2.1 (Ambarvalia), Fantham (1998) 11–18; for mimetic poetry in general, see A. Bulloch (1985), *Callimachus: The Fifth Hymn,* Cambridge, 6ff.; W. Albert (1988), *Das mimetische Gedicht in der Antike,* Frankfurt. Ovid is particularly influenced in this

section by Tibullus' mimetic representation of the Ambarvalia in poem 2.1 and by the first book of Vergil's *Georgics*; for Tibullan influence, see 663–70nn., Miller (1991) 108–18; for Vergilian influence, see 666n., 677n., 680n., 684n., 685–6n., 688n., 691–2n., Fantham (1992) 41–2.

As a result, though this section represents the single most informative discussion of the festival in extant literature, its intertextual nature should advise against any straightforwardly 'factual' reading of the ritual and prayer presented. In this section, 'fact' is inextricably caught up with (Callimachean) poetic embellishment, such as switches in speaker identity (681n.); the blending in of detail from different festivals (669n.); pathetic addresses to animals (663n., 685–6n.); evocation of different times in the farming season (665–6n., 681n., 685–6); competing views of farming (666n., 677n.); verbal play (671–2n., 677n., 678n., 685n.).

iii. *Political Resonance (697–704)*

The Feriae Sementivae, as one of the 'moveable festivals' in the Roman year, has no place in the official *fasti*; see 659–60n. There is, moreover, continued debate as to whether the festival typically occurred in December or January; see Miller (1991) 171 n. 16. Why, then, has Ovid chosen to deal with the festival at this point in late January (between 24th and 27th)? Why, in fact, has he chosen to mention it at all?

An answer may lie in the concluding part of the entry (697–704), in which the poet reflects on the intrinsic connection between agriculture and peace: whereas the warfare of the past had encouraged men to convert their farming implements into weapons (697–700), peace under the imperial ruler has brought about the right conditions for successful farming (701–4). This abrupt and unexpected transition sets the festival within a wider, political context and invites us to seek out (positive) political resonances not only in the concluding part of the entry but also in 657–704 as a whole.

In the immediate context of 697–704, Ovid pays homage to the much-vaunted *Pax Augusta*, and achieves a flattering contrast with the bleak outlook of the late Republic with a clever 'updating' of sentiments found at the end of Vergil's first *Georgic*; see 697–704n. Moreover, the close connection forged between Peace and Ceres (see 704n.) pays lip service to Augustus' use of Ceres as a symbol of fertility. Both

Augustus and (especially) Livia became associated with Ceres as guarantors of peace and fertility; see, in general, Spaeth (1996) 47–8, 119–23, 169–73.

Looking more widely at the entry as a whole, Ovid's direct prayer for the well-being of the crop (675–94), especially the call for the removal of pests (683–92), might have seemed particularly poignant in light of the severe famine that blighted Rome from c. A.D. 5–8; cf. Dio 55.22.3, 26.1, 31.3–4; P. Garnsey (1988), *Famine and Food Supply in the Graeco-Roman World*, Cambridge, 220–2. During this period, Augustus himself dedicated an altar to *Ceres Mater et Ops Augusta* (10th August, A.D. 7); cf. *Fasti Vallenses* (Degrassi 148), *Fasti Amiternini* (Degrassi 191), *Fasti Antiates Ministrorum domus Augustae* (Degrassi 208). It may also have been at this time that Augustus decided to start the rebuilding of the Temple of Liber, Libera and Ceres, which had burned down in the Circus Maximus in 31 B.C.; see T.P. Wiseman, "Liber: Myth. Drama and Ideology in Republican Rome", in C. Bruun (ed.), *The Roman Middle Republic: Politics, Religion and Historiography c. 400—133 B.C.*, Rome, 293–7. Though we are not specifically informed, these honours paid to the goddess of corn must surely have been linked to the famine, as either a plea for, or celebration of, salvation from the plague; see Le Bonniec (1958) 193–5, Pouthier (1981) 287–8. It is even possible that Ovid is alluding to the new altar in the present section by addressing Ceres as *mater* (671) and coupling her with Tellus, who is regularly identified with Ops; cf. Var. *L.* 5.64 *Terra Ops, quod hic omne opus et hac opus ad vivendum, et ideo dicitur Ops mater, quod terra mater*, Macr. 1.10.20, August. *C.D.* 7.24, Pouthier (1981) 268–73.

The inclusion of this moveable rustic festival, therefore, may be subtly designed to celebrate Augustus' protection of peace and agriculture, from the time of Actium to the challenges of the more recent past. As such, this section might be seen to develop the theme of Augustan peace which is prevalent in the latter part of Book 1; see Fantham (1985) 258–66, Pasco-Pranger (2002a) 260–73; see also 3n.

657 ter quater: a grand formula to express multiplicity of occasion; see 576n. The formula here enhances the sense of frustration encountered by the poet in his attempt to locate a moveable festival in the official calendars (see 659–60n.).

evolvi signantes tempora fastos "I unrolled the calendars which note the festal days": the *fasti* are the official calendars which Ovid often purports to consult; cf. 11, 289 *quod tamen ex ipsis licuit*

mihi discere fastis, 3.87–96 (foreign calendars), 6.57–64 (local calendars); for the status and function of these *fasti*, see 11n. The majority of those that survive are in the form of inscription (see Degrassi), but they also existed in the form of manuscripts, such that they would need to be unrolled (*evolvi*). For the individuals marks by which the days were noted, see 47–54nn. For *tempora* in the sense 'appointed times, festivals', see 1n.

658 Sementiva . . . dies: the festival was more commonly known as the Feriae Sementivae; for the festival in general, see 657–704 (i) n. As here, Ovid consistently refers to it as a one-day festival—cf. *lux haec* (659), *dies incerta* (661)—and this is supported by Varro; cf. *L.* 6.26 *Sementivae feriae dies is, qui a pontificibus dictus*, *R.* 1.2.1. By contrast, the Byzantine Johannes Lydus (*Mens.* 3.9) suggests that it was celebrated on two days, separated by an interval of seven days, the first sacred to Tellus and the second to Ceres; for discussion of this variant, see Le Bonniec (1958) 60ff.

659–60 lux haec indicitur . . . quid a fastis non stata sacra petis? "this day is publicly announced: why do you seek from the calendars rites whose dates are not fixed?": the Muse intervenes to inform Ovid that he will not find the festival in the official records because it is not confined to a particular date. Such 'moveable festivals', which depended rather on the season and the weather for their celebration, were known as *feriae conceptivae*, because they were appointed (*concipiuntur*) by the priests at the beginning of the year; cf. Var. *L.* 6.26, Fest. 55 L., Macr. 1.16.6 *conceptivae sunt quae quotannis a magistratibus vel a sacerdotibus concipiuntur.*

This is in fact the only one of the *feriae conceptivae* with which Ovid formally deals in the poem: there is brief allusion to the *Paganalia* (669n.), *Fornacalia* (2.527–30) and the *Compitalia* (5.140), and no reference at all to the *Feriae Latinae* (April) or the festival of the Dea Dia (May/June). In view of this, we might also be invited to read the Muse's utterance as programmatic: moveable festivals will have little place in Ovid's *Fasti* either.

659 (sensit enim): short, causal parentheses with *enim* are popular with Ovid; cf. 4.357–9 *institeram, quare primi Megalesia ludi/urbe forent nostra, cum dea (sensit enim)/. . . inquit* (Erato informs the poet), *Met.* 9.242 (Jupiter addresses the gods), von Albrecht (1964) 58f., 116f. This particular phrase constitutes a concise form of the more elaborate Vergilian parentheses; cf. e.g. Verg. *A.* 4.105–7 *olli (sensit enim simulata mente locutam,/quo regnum Italiae Libycas averteret oras)/sic contra est ingressa Venus* (Venus to Juno), 9.354.

660 Musa: the interlocutor Muse here is unspecified. She is neither bidden by the poet, nor is she afforded a formal entry or departure: she simply speaks and disappears. This represents the lowest level of engagement between poet and interlocutor employed in the poem; cf. 3.697ff. *praeteriturus eram gladios in principe fixos,/cum sic a castis Vesta locuta focis* (Vesta's brief, unbidden appearance), Miller (1983) 163–4.

661 utque dies incerta sacri, sic tempora certa "though the actual date of the rite is unfixed, the season is fixed": for this idiom (*ut . . . sic*) to express concession, see 333n.

662 seminibus iactis: *iacio* is the standard verb to express the manual scattering/sowing of seeds; cf. *Met.* 5.485, Var. *R.* 1.4.1, 1.29.2, Verg. *G.* 1.104, 2.57–8 *iam quae seminibus iactis se sustulit arbos,/tarda venit,* 317, Col. 1.7.6, *Thes.* 7.1.39.61ff.

663–70 From detached antiquarian researcher (657–62), Ovid's persona suddenly shifts to that of Master of Ceremony with a succession of direct commands and exhortations—663 *state,* 665 *suspendat,* 667–8 *da requiem,* 669 *agat, lustrate,* 670 *date*—by which he calls to task four different groups: the bullocks (663), the peasant (665), the farm steward (667) and the land workers (668–9); for mimetic representation of religious rites, see 657–704 (ii) n. These instructions are very closely modelled on the opening to Tibullus' agricultural poem 2.1. Ovid's calls for the garlanding of animals (663–4), the hanging up of the plough (665–6), rest for the earth and its workers (667–8) and lustration of the fields (669–70) mirror those given at Tib. 2.1.1–8, but in exactly the reverse order; see individual nn. Ovid has, however, been careful to adapt the material of Tibullus' May festival (Ambarvalia) so that it fits his own festival earlier in the season. As such, he makes clear that his requests arise not from the need to observe the sacrosanctity of a particular festal day, as in the Tibullan festival, but from observance of the season and the yearly rhythm of agriculture; see 664n., 665–6n.

663 state coronati plenum ad praesepe, iuvenci "stand garlanded at the full manger, bullocks": a similar instruction, in both sentiment and diction, is given by Tibullus to an unspecified human at the Ambarvalia festival; cf. Tib. 2.1.7–8 *nunc ad praesepia debent/ plena coronato stare boves capite.* However, Ovid immediately stamps a mark of originality by addressing the bullocks personally, which appears to be the first time a non-human entity is addressed in such mimetic

treatments of religious rites; cf. also the address to ants at 685–6.

coronati: for the customary crowning of animals at religious festivals, cf. 5.52 *illa coronatis alta triumphat equis* (Majesty's horses), 6.311, Prop. 4.1.21 (Vesta's asses), Dion. Hal. 1.33.2, Stat. *Silv.* 3.1.57ff. (dogs at Diana's festival).

plenum ad praesepe: for similar phraseology, cf. Verg. *G.* 3.495 *plena ad praesepia*, Tib. 2.1.7–8 *ad praesepia . . ./plena*, also Verg. *G.* 3.214 *satura ad praesepia*. As in the Tibullan festival, the full manger may have been a symbol of the fertility that the festival was designed to promote.

664 cum tepido vestrum vere redibit opus "with the warmth of spring your work will return": Ovid here remodels the Tibullan allusion so that it fits with his own festival in January. In ordering the animals to be garlanded, Tibullus is bidding them to stop work for the specific holy day in May. By contrast, the animals at Ovid's festival have not been to work on the land for about a month; Ovid alerts us to the difference by reminding the animals of their labour to come at the appropriate season (spring). The animals' work may have commenced very soon afterwards, as spring was reckoned to have arrived with the west wind at the beginning of February (c. 7th–10th); cf. 2.149–50 *quintus ab aequoreis nitidum iubar extulit undis/Lucifer, et primi tempora veris erunt* (10th February), Var. *R.* 1.28.1, Verg. *G.* 1.43–4 *vere novo, gelidus canis cum montibus umor/liquitur et Zephyro putris se glaeba resolvit*, Col. 11.2.15, Plin. *Nat.* 18. 239.

665–6 Ovid bids the plough to be hung up, just as Tibullus does in his festival; cf. Tib. 2.1.6 *et grave suspenso vomere cesset opus*. But unlike the Tibullan festival, it is not the holiness of the single day which demands the plough's rest, but the unsuitability of the season's climate: the ground in winter is unresponsive to ploughing (666).

If it is true that ploughing finished in mid December (see 657–704 (i) n.), Ovid's instructions here (and in 667–8) at the end of January appear somewhat belated. We have three options here: either the festival actually occurred in December; or the festival did occur in (late) January, but the prayer itself involved a more general survey of the different times in the agricultural year; or, perhaps most likely, Ovid himself is playing about with different times of season in his prayer; see 657–704 (ii) n.

665 emeritum . . . aratrum: the ancient plough had no wheels or blade, and worked by coursing through the top soil; see Spurr

(1986) 27–35, Mynors on Verg. *G.* 1.169–75. Certain types of plough were apparently very light (Var. *R.* 1.20.2, 4, Col. 2.2.23), such that they could have been hung up when not in use. *emeritum* can be taken in the neutral sense 'which has performed its task' (see e.g. Bömer, Schilling, *Thes.* 5.2.471.59ff.) or in the sentimentalising sense 'that has earned its rest' (Frazer, *OLD* s.v. 1c) or 'worn out' (Lewis/Short).

palo: *palum*, here in the sense 'peg, hook', is used of any type of horizontal fixture to a wall or door; cf. Pl. *Mil.* 1140, Var. *R.* 3.5.4, 3.8.2 (perch for birds), Col. 8.3.4 (peg for wicker-basket), *Thes.* 10.1.175.83ff.

666 omne reformidat frigore volnus humus "the ground starts back in dread at every wound in the cold": the idea that the earth suffers pain through farming is most famously associated with the moralising discourse of the Decline of Ages. In the Golden Age, the earth was untouched and bore fruits of its own accord; in subsequent ages, the earth suffered wounds as it was delved into for the sake of farming; for the image, cf. *Rem.* 172 *sauciet ut duram vomer aduncus humum*, *Met.* 1.101–2, 2.285–7 *hosne mihi fructus . . . quod adunci vulnera aratri/rastrorumque fero totoque exerceor anno* (Earth speaking) with Bömer ad loc., Verg. *Ecl.* 4.40, Tib. 1.7.30.

The image of the ground as sentient, capable of feeling pain and fear (*reformidat*), is a surprising addition to a prayer designed to celebrate the crop, and demonstrates Ovid's keenness to play around with competing views of farming in this section: cf. 671 and 673, where Tellus/Terra are willing accomplices in farming.

reformidat: the verb is only used of inanimate entities once before; cf. Verg. *G.* 2.369 [*ulmi*] *ante reformidant ferrum.*

667–8 Ovid now bids rest for both spheres of agriculture—the earth (the metaphorical worker) and the men who cultivate the land—in much the same way as Tibullus; cf. Tib. 2.1.5 *luce sacra requiescat humus, requiescat arator*; for anaphora as a feature of sacerdotal language, see 67–70n. It is certainly the case that all agricultural work was banned on festival days; cf. e.g. Cato *Agr.* 138, Tib. 2.1.5, Serv. *G.* 1.268 *sane feriis terram ferro tangi nefas est.* But the call for the cessation of farm work in Ovid's festival is due rather to the season; see 665–6n.

667 vilice: the *vilicus* was the steward (usually a slave) who managed the farm and its workers on behalf of the owner; cf. Cato *Agr.* 2, Col. 1.7.6–7, 11.1.3ff, White (1970) 350ff. By channelling his appeal through the steward, therefore, Ovid's call has a more realistic feel than that of Tibullus. With the exception of this occurrence

and Hor. *Ep.* 1.14.1, the *vilicus* is a character shunned by the Augustan poets, most notably Vergil in his *Georgics*. He is a figure more commonly found in 'lower' genres such as comedy (Pl. *Cas.* 98, *Mer.* 277), satire (Lucil. 532 Marx, Juv. 3.228) and epigram (*Priap.* 24.1, Mart. 3.58.31, 10.92.5).

669 pagus agat festum: pagum lustrate: Ovid bids each *pagus*, the individual rural districts, to conduct a purification of the land. This rite, known as a *lustratio agri* or *ambarvalia*, involved leading animals around the boundaries of the land before sacrificing them. It appears to have been conducted at various stages during the farming year, in an attempt to ensure divine favour for the crop or herd; cf. e.g. Cato *Agr.* 141, Verg. *Ecl.* 5.75, *G.* 1.338–50 (January/February) with Mynors ad loc., Hor. *Carm.* 3.18 (December), Tib. 1.1.21–4, 2.1.1–2 (May).

The triple repetition in *pagus* . . . *pagum* . . . *paganis* (669–70), however, suggests that Ovid is alluding to the specific festival of the Paganalia. Very little is known about the Paganalia or its possible connection with the Feriae Sementivae. Some suggest that they are two manifestations of the same festival (the former celebrated in the country, the latter in the city), while others suggest that they are sometimes evoked together (cf. Var. *L.* 6.26) simply because they are both moveable, agricultural festivals; for the differing views, see Miller (1991) 172 n.23. It is worth noting here that it would be entirely in line with Callimachean mimetic representation of religious rites for Ovid to blend in details from more than one festival; see Cairns (1979) 133–4.

670 liba were the sacrificial cakes, made of cheese, flour and egg (Cato *Agr.* 75), which were the standard rustic offering at the altars of deities; cf. 128 (Janus), 2.644 (Terminus), 3.734 *libaque, quod sanctis pars datur inde focis*, 4.776 (Pales), 6.476 (Mater Matuta), Verg. *Ecl.* 7.33 (Priapus), *Thes.* 7.2.1353.28ff.

671–2 placentur frugum matres, Tellusque Ceresque,/farre suo gravidae visceribusque suis "Let the mothers of the corn, Earth and Ceres, be propitiated with their own spelt (i.e. the spelt which they help to produce) and the flesh of a pregnant sow": Ovid's coupling of Ceres and Tellus here, on the grounds that they are both creative forces in agriculture, reflects the conceptual connection popularly made between the two goddesses; cf. Cic. *N.D.* 1.40, 3.52, Var. *Ant.* 27 Card., *R.* 3.1.5, Hor. *Saec.* 29–30, Le Bonniec (1958) 48–52. Both deities may have been worshipped separately on the day of the Feriae Sementivae, if Varro is correct to suggest that

there was also an urban celebration at the temple of Tellus; cf. *R.* 1.2.1 *Sementivis feriis in aedem Telluris veneram,* Johannes Lydus *Mens.* 3.9; but see also Le Bonniec (1958) 60–4.

It is clear from the possessive *suo* (672) that both deities received the emmer wheat. This was also the case with the sow, which is elsewhere acknowledged as a suitable victim for both deities; cf. Var. *Vit. Pop. Rom.* fr. 104 Rip. *quod humatus non sit, heredi porca praecidanea suscipienda Telluri et Cereri;* as a victim to Tellus, cf. Hor. *Ep.* 2.1.139ff., Macr. 1.12.20; to Ceres, cf. 349, *Pont.* 2.9.29–30, Macr. 3.11.10. A pregnant victim was chosen to correspond with the 'teeming' earth, and it was hoped that the sacrifice of one pregnancy would lead to successful germination in the agricultural sphere; cf. 4.629–34 esp. 633–4 *nunc gravidum pecus est, gravidae quoque semine terrae:/Telluri plenae victima plena datur* (Fordicidia) with Fantham ad loc.

There is great potential for word-play in 672. First, before taking in the entire line, we may be tempted to understand *farre suo gravidae* as referring back to the mothers, Ceres and Tellus, who are 'pregnant' (the primary meaning of *gravidus*) with their own spelt; for the popular metaphor of pregnancy for the ripe crop, cf. e.g. 3.766, 4.633 (quoted above), *Met.* 1.110, Verg. *G.* 1.111, *Thes.* 6.2.2271.4ff. Secondly, *suis* is deceptive: though it is actually genitive of *sus* ('sow'), the preceding *suo* tempts us to take it as part of *suus* ('their own flesh').

671 matres: *mater* is a standard cult name for both deities; for Ceres, cf. e.g. Verg. *G.* 1.163, Liv. 24.38.3, Spaeth (1996) 42–4; for *mater frugum,* cf. *Met.* 6.118, also *Am.* 3.10.35 *diva potens frugum;* for Tellus/Terra, cf. *Met.* 15.91, Var. *L.* 5.64, Liv. 1.56.2, Lucr. 5.1402, *Thes.* 8.442.71ff. For the possible allusion to the altar of *Ceres Mater et Ops Augusta,* see 657–704 (iii) n.

672 visceribusque "innards": for Ovid's inconsistency with the sacrificial terminology *exta* and *viscera,* see 51n., 588n.

673 officium . . . tuentur "they observe their duty": the idiom is rare; cf. Cic. *Fam.* 3.9.1 *qua in omnibus officiis tuendis erga te observantia et constantia fuissem,* 13.1.4, Col. 12 *praef.* 10, *Thes.* 9.2.525.27ff.

674 haec praebet causam frugibus, illa locum "the one offers the corn its vital force, the other its space": *haec* clearly refers back to the first element in the previous clause (*Ceres*), *illa* to the second (*Terra*). This reversal of the usual rules for *hic . . . ille* is predominantly poetic and not found in prose before Seneca; cf. e.g. *Am.* 2.4.45–6, *Her.* 1.39–40, *Met.* 1.539, Cat. 97.3, Prop. 2.1.38, Verg.

A. 8.357–8 *hanc Ianus pater, hanc Saturnus condidit arcem;/Ianiculum huic, illi fuerat Saturnia nomen, Thes.* 6.3.2716.32ff.

causam: for *causa* in the sense 'principle of life' or 'vital force' (Frazer), cf. Cic. *Phil.* 2.55 *in seminibus est causa arborum et stirpium, Fin.* 5.4.10.

675–94 Ovid now conducts a prayer to the two deities, Ceres and Tellus. After a general plea for a good harvest for the farmer (675–8), the speaker pleads for fair conditions for the crop at every stage of its growth, and the removal of various detrimental forces. Though the order is not entirely chronological, the prayer follows the crop's progress from the seed (679–86) to the growing plant (687–90) to the ripening harvest (691–4). Ovid here follows a tradition of agricultural prayers to various deities in an effort to promote the fertility of the crop or herd; cf. 4.747–76 (Pales), 911–32 (Mildew), Cato *Agr.* 141 (Mars), Hor. *S.* 2.2.124 (Ceres), Tib. 1.1.24 (Lares), 2.1.17–24; cf. also *Dirae* 9ff. (a reversal of the motifs in a curse on the land). The persona of the poet is again equivalent to Master of Ceremony, though the relationship between speaker and farmer is not always consistent (see 681n.); for mimetic representation of religious rites in general, see 657–704 (ii) n.

675–6 "Partners in labour, through whom the days of old were improved and the acorns of the oak superseded by a more profitable food": acorns were traditionally regarded as the staple of the pre-agricultural diet, and Ceres is typically credited with the introduction of farming to mankind and a more profitable form of sustenance; cf. 4.401–2 *prima Ceres homine ad meliora alimenta vocato/mutavit glandes utiliore cibo, Am.* 3.10.7ff., Verg. *G.* 1.7–8 *alma Ceres, vestro si munere tellus/Chaoniam pingui glandem mutavit arista,* 147ff., Tib. 2.1.37–8, *Thes.* 6.2.2032.18ff. By speaking of ancient times as having been 'improved' (*correcta*) by the discovery of a 'more useful food' (*utiliore cibo,* as at 4.402), the introduction of agriculture into the lives of man is cast in a positive light, appropriate in a prayer to the goddesses. It is not, however, the only philosophy of agriculture on offer in this section; see 666n., 677n.

675 correcta vetustas: for *corrigo* in the sense 'change for the better, improve', cf. *Pont.* 3.9.20, Cic. *Att.* 6.1.10, Plin. *Nat.* 17.116 *nostra aetas correxit, ut Gallica uteretur terebra, Thes.* 4.1035.40ff.

676 quernaque glans victa est utiliore cibo: for the collocation *querna glans,* cf. Verg. *G.* 1.305, Tib. 2.1.38, Col. 9.1.5, Plin.

Nat. 16.16; for the potential ambivalence of this sentiment, see 677n.

677–8 The main priority of the farmer—to secure a comfortable style of living from a successful harvest—is brought to the forefront of agricultural prayers; cf. Cato *Agr.* 141.2, Tib. 2.1.21–2 *tum nitidus plenis confisus rusticus agris/ingeret ardenti grandia ligna foco.*

677 frugibus immensis: *immensus* in the quantitative sense 'vast amounts of' first occurs in a similar context in Vergil; cf. Verg. *G.* 1.49 *illius immensae ruperunt horrea messes,* Ov. *Met.* 6.181, Tac. *Hist.* 2.32, *Thes.* 7.1.452.55ff.

avidos: a provocative epithet. *avidus* is primarily used in the pejorative sense to denote financial greed, avarice; see *OLD* s.v. 1, *Thes.* 2.1424.31ff. The suggestion that the farmer's primary motivation is profit ties in with the discourse of the Decline of Ages, where farming symbolised man's greed for more than the earth could produce naturally; cf. e.g. *Am.* 3.8.39–41, *Met.* 1.101–6, 113–24; for other allusions to this discourse, see 666n. It may also have the effect of putting a negative gloss on the surrounding sentiments: for example, does *utiliore* (676) mean 'more nutritionally useful' or 'more financially profitable'?

678 cultus . . . sui: Ovid here plays on two different senses of *cultus*: 'tilling' (*OLD* s.v. 2) and 'worship' (*OLD* s.v. 10).

679 vos date perpetuos teneris sementibus auctus "grant uninterrupted growth to the tender seeds": the prayer for continuous increase for the crop might recall Ovid's earlier prayer for 'increase' for the Emperor; see 613n.

680 nec nova per gelidas herba sit usta nives "and do not let the new blade be nipped by the frozen snows": *uro* is used paradoxically here to describe the 'scorching' effect of the cold. Though Ovid may be the first to use *uro* in this sense, its compound *aduro* has already been used by Vergil in a similar context to describe the effect of the cold on the young crop; cf. Verg. *G.* 1.92–3 *ne tenues pluviae rapidive potentia solis/acrior aut Boreae penetrabile frigus adurat,* Ov. *Fast.* 4.918, *Met.* 14.763, *Tr.* 3.2.8, Luc. 4.52 *urebant montana nives,* Mart. 8.68.3, *Thes.* 1.898.59ff. For *herba* denoting the first shoot that emerges from the ground, see 154n.

681 cum serimus: as it is generally believed that the Feriae Sementivae took place after the completion of the sowing, the present tenses *serimus* and *aperite* are intriguing. It seems that Ovid is intent on coursing through the lifetime of the crop right from the outset, just as he will progress right to the finished product (693–4).

Either chronological survey was part of the actual festival, or (most likely) it is a matter of poetic licence; see 657–704 (ii) n.

Besides this, *serimus* suggests that the speaker is here identifying himself with the farmers who work the land. This is at odds with his established persona as Master of Ceremony, which elsewhere requires him to make a distinction between himself and the rustics; cf. *pagum lustrate, coloni* (669), *satiate colonos* (677), *haec ego pro vobis, haec vos optate coloni* (695). This intriguing shift in persona is also a feature of the speaker of Tibullus' rustic festival; for identity with farmers, cf. Tib. 2.1.17 *dii patrii, purgamus agros, purgamus agrestes*; for distance from farmers, cf. Tib. 2.1.21 *tum nitidus plenis confisus rusticus agris*; see also Miller (1991) 114–15.

caelum ventis aperite serenis "make the sky clear by calm winds": the implication here is that the winds will clear away the rain clouds, making a fine day suitable for sowing. The use of the verb *aperio* in the specific sense 'make clear' is rare—cf. Liv. 22.6.9 *cum incalescente sole dispulsa nebula aperuisset diem*—though this sense is required in the popular phrase *apertum caelum* ('clear sky'); cf. *Ars* 1.247 *luce deas caeloque Paris spectavit aperto*, Cic. *Div.* 1.2, Verg. *A.* 1.394–5, 587, *Thes.* 2.221.17ff.

The close proximity of *serimus* and *serenis* suggests etymological play, as sowing was sometimes thought to derive its name from the fair conditions required for its success; cf. Isid. *Orig.* 17.2.6 *serere . . . vocatum, quia hoc sereno caelo faciendum est, non per imbres.*

682 aetheria . . . aqua: an innovative phrase to describe rain which is apparently unique (*Thes.* 1.1153.58).

683–92 Ovid turns to praying for the absence of a variety of forces detrimental to the growing crop: birds (683–4), ants (685–6), mildew (687), disease (688), darnel (691) and wild oats (692). This kind of plea for the absence of known menaces was a standard feature of agricultural prayers; cf. 4.763, 767, Cato *Agr.* 141.2 *uti tu morbos visos invisosque, viduertatem vastitudinemque, calamitates intemperiasque prohibessis defendas averruncesque*, Tib. 2.1.17–20.

683–4 "Ensure that the birds, noxious to the tilled land, do not ravage the fields of Ceres in a column intent on causing injury": birds are a well-known menace to the growing crop; cf. *Met.* 5.484–5, Verg. *G.* 1.155–6, Hor. *S.* 1.8.6, Sauvage (1975) 145. However, this sentence unfolds in deceptive fashion. The accumulation of military imagery in this couplet leads us to expect a fearsome (human) enemy

to the corn—they come in a column (*agmine*) to pillage and injure (*laesuro depopulentur*); the final revealing word, *aves*, comes as a surprise.

683 Cerialia rura: though the adjective *Cerialis* is frequently used in the metonymic sense 'of corn' (cf. e.g. 4.911, *Met.* 1.123, *Rem.* 173, Verg. *G.* 2.517), this particular phrase ('fields of Ceres/of corn') is apparently unique (*Thes. Onom.* 2.344.30). It adds to the military imagery in the couplet, expressing the birds' antics as almost an invasion into another individual's territory.

684 depopulentur: this distinctly unpoetic military verb—found only in Ovid amongst the Augustan poets (cf. *Tr.* 3.10.56)—is used here in a transferred sense to refer to the 'ravaging' effect of animals on vegetation; cf. Plin. *Nat.* 19.39 *publicani qui pascua conducunt... depopulantur pecorum pabulo.* Ovid may be alluding specifically to Vergil's similarly transferred usage of *populo* to describe the destructive tendencies of ants and weevils; cf. Verg. *G.* 1.185–6 *populatque ingentem farris acervum/curculio atque...formica*; for further use of *populo(r)* in this sense, cf. Col. 9.7.5, Stat. *Theb.* 9.189, *OLD* s.v. 1b.

685–6 Turning his attention to the ants, Ovid again (as in 683–4) describes animal pursuits using military language: the crop is their booty (*praedae*), and its seeds are prisoners at the ants' mercy (*subiectis parcite granis*). The use of military language for ants recalls Verg. *G.* 1.185–6 (see 684n.).

The full sentiment here is most surprising: Ovid calls not for the ants' complete abstention, but merely for the postponement of their action until after the harvest, when they might enjoy a greater reward. In structuring his appeal in this way, Ovid plays to the proverbial diligence of ants in their acquisition of food; cf. e.g. *Met.* 7.624–5 *hic nos frugilegas adspeximus agmine longo/grande onus exiguo formicas ore gerentes*, *Ars* 1.93–4, *Tr.* 1.9a.9, Hor. *S.* 1.1.32–5, Pease on Verg. *A.* 4.402. Rather than turning his back on the welfare of the crop, however, Ovid may still be promoting its interests: is he wittily trying to beguile the ants by encouraging them to take their fill after the harvest, knowing full well that there are sure means of preventing their access to the harvested grain once it has entered the threshing floor (Cato *Agr.* 91, Verg. *G.* 1.178–86)?

685 subiectis... granis: both the literal sense 'the seeds that have been sown under the ground' (cf. 662 *seminibus iactis*) and the military sense 'the subjected seeds' are active here.

687 Looking further ahead to the threats to the growing crop, Ovid highlights the problem of mildew, which was considered so

ruinous that it required its own festival and prayer; cf. 4.905ff. (Robigalia) with Frazer and Fantham ad loc., Verg. *G.* 1.150–1 *mox et frumentis labor additus, ut mala culmos/esset robigo.*

scabrae: the standard epithet for *robigo*, whether it describes mildew or rust; for mildew, cf. 4.921 *parce, precor, scabrasque manus a messibus aufer*, *Met.* 8.802, Cato *Agr.* 94; for rust, cf. *Pont.* 1.1.71, Verg. *G.* 1.495.

688 "nor let the crop grow pallid in sickness because of a disease-ridden sky".

vitio caeli "defect of the sky" i.e. "disease-ridden sky": disease was traditionally believed to have been caused by harmful seeds being carried through the air, turning it noxious or 'defective'; for the philosophy, cf. e.g. Lucr. 6.1090ff.; for similarly-styled phrases for a disease-carrying sky, cf. *Ars* 2.319–20 *sed si male firma cubarit,/et vitium caeli senserit aegra sui*, Verg. *Ecl.* 7.57, *G.* 3.478–9 *hic quondam morbo caeli miseranda coorta est/tempestas*, *A.* 3.138.

aegra seges: the MSS are split between the readings *aegra* (**Uζς**) and *ulla* (**Aω**). The problem with *ulla* is the consequent disjointed effect on *seges*, subject of clauses in both 687 and 688: *seges* in 687 would take the general sense (the crop in general), whereas in 688 it would take a specific sense, denoting one of many individual cornfields/sets of crops. *aegra* is well-attested, continues the focus on disease, and is elsewhere used of blighted vegetation; cf. Verg. *A.* 3.142 (*seges*), Plin. *Nat.* 17.259 (trees), Palladius 4.7.4 (vines), *Thes.* 1.939.49–50.

689–90 Ovid prays for a healthy balance for the crop in terms more readily associated with humans: it should avoid being either too 'lean' (*macie* with n.) or too 'fat', 'indulgent' in its own 'riches' (*divitiis* with n., *luxuriosa* with n.). As the former concern has already been dealt with, in terms of the forces which blight crops (683–8), emphasis here falls on the latter. Overgrowth or over-exuberance were recognised dangers in all spheres of agriculture; cf. e.g. Verg. *G.* 1.191–2 *at si luxuria foliorum exuberat umbra/nequiquam pinguis palea teret area culmos*, 2.252–5 (soil), 3.135–6, Col. 4.21 (vine), Plin. *Nat.* 18.154, Spurr (1986) 64–5.

689 macie: *macies*, literally 'leanness (of the body)', is first applied by Ovid to the agricultural sphere to describe the blighted crop/land; cf. Col. 1.4.3 *in exili terra cultoris prudentia ac diligentia maciem soli vincere potest*, Plin. *Nat.* 18.199, *Thes.* 8.19.22ff.

690 divitiis: the term is applied here to an abundance of a natural product; cf. e.g. *Am.* 3.6.93–4 *pluviamque nivesque . . . quas tibi divitias pigra ministrat hiems*, Cic. *Fin.* 2.90, Sen. *Thy.* 162, Luc. 9.427.

luxuriosa: as with *luxuria* and *luxus*, *luxuriosus* is applied to the agricultural sphere to denote exuberance of vegetation; cf. Cic. *Orat.* 81, Col. 4.21.2 *luxuriosa vitis, nisi fructu conpescitur, male deflorescit*, Plin. *Nat.* 17.26, *Thes.* 7.2.1933.21ff.

691–2 Looking at the field as a whole, Ovid prays for the absence of darnel (*loliis*) and wild oats (*sterilis . . . avena*). These two widely-recognised pests to the crop are often evoked together; cf. Enn. *Protrepticus* (Vahlen fr. 31) *ubi videt avenam lolium crescere inter triticum*, Verg. *Ecl.* 5.37, *G.* 1.152–4 *intereunt segetes . . ./infelix lolium et steriles dominantur avenae*, Calp. *Ecl.* 4.116.

691 loliis oculos vitiantibus: *lolium* is darnel, a useless ryegrass which was widely acknowledged as a persistent weed in crops; cf. *Met.* 5.485, Plin. *Nat.* 18.153, White (1970) 137, Mynors on Verg. *G.* 1.154. Its harmful effect on the eyes is also acknowledged by Plautus, when Sceledrus jibes that Palaestrio's lack of vision may stem from contact with this plant; cf. Pl. *Mil.* 321–2 *mirumst lolio victitare te tam vili tritico . . . quid iam? . . . quia luscitiosu's.*

692 avena: as an infestation of wild oats could override and destroy a corn crop, their removal was actively encouraged; cf. Cato *Agr.* 37.5, Cic. *Fin.* 5.91, *Dirae* 15, Plin. *Nat* 18.149, Spurr (1986) 61.

693–4 "May the field return with huge interest produces of wheat, emmer—destined to endure the fire twice—and barley".

693 triticeos fetus: as the technical name for wheat, *triticum*, is awkward in dactylic verse, the derivative adjective *triticeus* is used as part of a periphrastic phrase; cf. *Met.* 5.486 *triticeas messes*, Verg. *G.* 1.219 *triticeam in messem.*

passuraque farra bis ignem: Ovid alludes to the two-fold process required in the preparation of emmer wheat. First, the husk had to be separated from the wheat by grilling. Then, the wheat needed to be baked for consumption; cf. 2.521 *usibus admoniti flammis torrenda dederunt*, 6.313, André (1981) 55–6, Spurr (1986) 12.

694 ingenti fenore reddat: the metaphor comes from banking: the seed is 'lent' to the soil, which is then expected to return with 'interest' in the form of a full harvest; cf. *Rem.* 173–4, Cic. *Sen.* 51, Verg. *G.* 1.224, Tib. 2.6.21–2 *Spes sulcis credit aratis/semina, quae magno faenore reddat ager*, Col. 4.3.5, *Thes.* 6.1.483.66ff.

695 haec ego pro vobis, haec vos optate coloni: Ovid marks a strong distinction here between himself (*ego*) and the farmers (*pro vobis, vos . . . coloni*); cf. also 669. Elsewhere, he identifies himself with the farmers (see 681n.). For anaphora (*haec*) as a feature of sacerdotal language, see 67–70n.

697–704 Ovid concludes his dealings with the Feriae Sementivae by looking at the festival from a wider, political angle: agriculture is only now possible at all because of peace (the absence of war). After a recollection of the wars of the grim past, when farming tools were either discarded or reshaped into weapons (697–700), Ovid focuses more positively on the present, praising the ruling house for instilling a peace which is conducive to farming (701–4).

This section continues the celebration of the peace instilled by the imperial family; see 3n., 657–704 (iii) n. In articulating this message, however, Ovid has cleverly remodelled the sentiments found at the end of the first book of Vergil's *Georgics*. At the end of *Georgic* 1, Vergil, looking out from the time of the civil wars, sees men diverted from agriculture to warfare as a present reality; cf. Verg. *G.* 1.505–8 *quippe ubi fas versum atque nefas: tot bella per orbem,/tam multae scelerum facies; non ullus aratro/dignus honos, squalent abductis arva colonis,/et curvae rigidum falces conflantur in ensem.* Ovid is able to 'update' the Vergilian imagery by looking back at a period of war which has long ended and celebrating the present peace; for similar positive 'updating' of Georgic sentiment, cf. 4.921–30 (Robigalia) with Gee (2002) 53–6. For good measure, Ovid also 'updates' imagery from Vergil's *Aeneid* as well; see 701–2n.

697–8 erat aptior ensis/vomere: the comparison made between sword and ploughshare is justified, as both are capable of inflicting injury in their respective spheres; for the ploughshare 'wounding' the earth, cf. e.g. *Rem.* 172, *Met.* 1.101–2 *nec ullis/saucia vomeribus per se dabat omnia tellus*; see also 666n. A similar comparison for similar reason is made again at 2.517: *plus erat in gladio quam curvo laudis aratro.*

698 taurus arator: the adjectival use of *arator* is rare, and possibly first in Ovid; cf. *Dirae* 80, Suet. *Ves.* 5.4 *bos arator . . . triclinium irrupit*, *Thes.* 2.398.41ff.

699–700 In creating an image of war's domination over agriculture, Ovid highlights three farming tools—the hoe (*sarcula*), the mattock (*ligones*) and the toothed hoe (*rastri*)—which have either ceased their normal work or been turned into military equipment. These three implements are put to similar malign use by the Maenads, who use them as weapons against Orpheus; cf. *Met.* 11.35ff. *vacuosque iacent dispersa per agros/sarculaque rastrique graves longique ligones:/quae postquam rapuere ferae.*

The transformation of farming implements into weapons was a graphic means of highlighting man's desertion of agriculture in favour of warfare; cf. Lucr. 5.1293–6, Verg. *G.* 1.508 *curvae rigidum falces*

conflantur in ensem, *A.* 7.635–6 *vomeris huc et falcis honos, huc omnis aratri/cessit amor; recoquunt patrios fornacibus ensis.* Ovid builds up a progression of thought here, as the sentiments become increasingly more ominous. First, the hoes simply stop their work (*sarcula cessabant*). Then the mattocks not only stop their usual work, but are also fashioned (easily) into weapons (*versique . . . ligones*). Finally, the transformation from hoe to helmet (700) is a novel and contrived image, representing a radical change which effectively demonstrates the sheer lengths to which man went to promote war over agriculture.

699 versique: for *verto* in the sense 'transform', see 369n.

701–2 "Thanks be to the gods and your house! For a long time now have Wars been laid low beneath your foot, bound in chains": the house in question is that of the imperial family, as Augustus proverbially ended the civil wars with his victory over Antony at Actium in 31 B.C.

The personification of *Bella* as a captive downtrodden (*sub pede*) and chained (*religata catenis*) recalls—and, indeed, represents the fulfilment of—the famous prophecy of Jupiter in Verg. *A.* 1, in which the future Augustus is hailed as a man who will secure peace and keep *Furor* chained within the temple of Janus; cf. Verg. *A.* 1.294–6 *claudentur Belli portae; Furor impius intus/saeva sedens super arma et centum vinctus aënis/post tergum nodis.* Here and elsewhere, Ovid replaces *Furor* with *Bella* as the destructive force locked up in the temple of Janus; cf. 124 *ni teneant rigidae condita Bella serae*, *Pont.* 1.2.124, Green (2000). The entire image of a special individual's long-time triumph over *Bella* works as a flattering reversal of 697: *bella diu tenuere viros.*

701 domuique tuae: for the concept of the *domus Augusta*, see 532n. The intended addressees of *tuae* and *vestro* (702) are, as ever, difficult to determine, but I take *tuae* to refer to Ovid's immediate addressee in Book 1, Germanicus; *vestro* would therefore be a general address to several individuals of the imperial family who have helped secure peace, namely Augustus, Tiberius, Drusus and Germanicus; for the post-Augustan outlook of Book 1, see Introduction, II. For the switch in person between *tuus* and *vester* in imperial eulogy, see also 285n.

703 "Let the oxen go under the yoke, let the seed go under the ploughed land": the repetition of *sub* here, and in 702 (*sub pede*), creates a verbal link between the subjugation of war and the process of farming which matches the underlying theme of farming's reliance on peace.

704 Pax Cererem nutrit, Pacis alumna Ceres "Peace nurtures Ceres, Ceres is the foster-child of Peace": peace (the absence of war) is necessary for agriculture, and the intrinsic connection between the two is widely acknowledged; cf. e.g. 4.407–8 *pace Ceres laeta est; et vos orate, coloni,/perpetuam pacem pacificumque ducem*, Ar. *Pax* 520 (Peace the Grape-Giver), Call. *Cer.* 137, Tib. 1.10.45ff. *Pax candida primum/duxit araturos sub iuga curva boves,/Pax aluit vites*, 67–8, Spaeth (1996) 67–9; see also Spaeth (1996) 125–51, who argues that the woman on the Italia relief of the Ara Pacis can be identified with Ceres. Ovid is, however, the first to personalise their relationship as one between nurse and nursling. For the Augustan connection forged between Ceres and peace, see 657–704 (iii) n.

705–8 27th January Tiberius' rebuilding of the temple of Castor and Pollux

705–8 Though the rebuilding of the temple of Castor and Pollux took place two years before Ovid's exile (see 706n.), there is an attractive case for suggesting that these lines were added at a later stage to an existing text in an attempt to offer additional praise to the imperial family. If these lines are removed, 704 and 709 would form the perfect transition from the section on Feriae Sementivae to that of the Ara Pacis: *Pax Cererem nutrit, Pacis alumna Ceres . . . ipsum nos carmen deduxit Pacis ad aram.* The praise of present peace that follows (711–18) would then be a logical progression from the recent focus on past war (697–700); for the argument, see Wünsch (1901) 401–2.

705 at quae venturas praecedet sexta Kalendas "but the sixth (day) which will precede the coming Kalends": the phraseology directly reflects the Roman calendar notation for this date—VI Kal. Feb.—and is one of only four occasions in Book 1 on which Ovid attempts to reproduce such official forms of dating; cf. 311 *ergo ubi nox aderit venturis tertia Nonis* (III Non., 3rd), 315 *Nonae* (Non., 5th), 587 *Idibus* (Idus, 13th); elsewhere, cf. 5.417, 603, 6.211.

praecedet (**Uζς**): the verb is used occasionally of chronological precedence; cf. Lucr. 4.838–9 *sed potius longe linguae praecessit origo/sermonem*, Sen. *Nat.* 6.12.2, *Thes.* 10.2.400.70ff. The future *praecedet* is, on balance, preferable to *praecedit* (**Aω**), in that Ovid more often chooses to introduce new days in Book 1 using the future tense; cf.

311–12, 315–16, 317–18, 461–2, 617–18, 651–2, 653–4, 655–6, 710 (as opposed to 459, 587–8 (present), 637 (past)).

706 Ledaeis templa dicata deis: the divine sons of Leda are Castor and Pollux, to whom a temple was first dedicated out of gratitude for their intervention as fighting horsemen in the battle of Lake Regillus in either 499 or 496 B.C.; for the story, cf. Dion. Hal. 6.13, Plu. *Cor.* 3.4. Livy (2.42.5) suggests that the dedication date for the original temple was 15th July; for differing views on the reliability of Livy here, see Degrassi 403, Ogilvie on Liv. 2.42.5. However, there is no doubt surrounding the date of Tiberius' rebuilding of the temple, which was dedicated, in his own name and that of his late brother, on 27th January A.D. 6; cf. *Fasti Praenestini* (Degrassi 117) *Aedi(s Castoris et Po)llucis dedicat(a est)*, *Fasti Verulani* (Degrassi 161); see also Suet. *Tib.* 20 *dedicavit . . . item Pollucis et Castoris suo fratrisque nomine de manubiis*, Dio 55.27.4. Ovid says nothing about the temple itself or the reason behind its dedication, but merely takes advantage of the occasion to forge a neat, complimentary link between dedicators and dedicatees (707n.).

707 fratribus illa deis fratres de gente deorum: the double noun polyptoton (*fratribus/fratres, deis/deorum*) conveys a flattering divine connection between dedicatees (divine brothers Castor and Pollux) and dedicators (brothers Tiberius and Drusus, divine by adoption into the Julian family); see, in general, Green (2004) 226–7. Moreover, as Castor and Pollux were regarded as a model of brotherly concord (cf. e.g. V. Max. 5.5.3), the association reflects positively on the mortal brothers, and continues the theme of imperial family solidarity in Book 1; see 10n., 637–50 (ii) n., 649n., 650n.

Ovid is fond of (multiple) polyptoton; cf. *Her.* 12.19–20, *Met.* 15.88–90 *heu quantum scelus est in viscera viscera condi/congestoque avidum pinguescere corpore corpus/alteriusque animantem animantis vivere leto*, Wills (1996) 206, 213ff. The sentiment here, however, invites particular comparison with *Epic. Drusi* 283–98: in dealing with the finished reconstruction of the same temple (*adice Ledaeos . . . fratres* (283)), emphasis is put on the *discrepancy* between both parties in the light of Drusus' death; cf. 290 '*cur adeo fratres, heu, sine fratre deos?*' (Tiberius speaking).

708 circa Iuturnae . . . lacus: it is famously related that, during the battle of Lake Regillus, the two auxiliary horsemen, Castor and Pollux, washed and watered their horses at the pool of Juturna (see Platner/Ashby 311–13). Consequently, this was the spot, in the south-east corner of the Forum, which was chosen for the first tem-

ple to the divine brothers; cf. Dion. Hal. 6.13.2–4, Plu. *Cor.* 3.4, Platner/Ashby 102ff., Steinby I.242ff.

composuere: for *compono* in the specific sense of 'building a monument', synonymous with *aedifico*, cf. Prop. 4.9.73–4 *hunc . . ./sic Sanctum Tatiae composuere Cures* (Ara Maxima), Man. 3.100, *Thes.* 3.2122.79ff.

709–22 30th January Dedication of the Altar of Augustan Peace

i. *The Monument*

As soon as Augustus had returned from Spain and Gaul, on 4th July 13 B.C., the Senate decreed that an altar be set up to Augustan Peace, now known as the Ara Pacis Augustae. The finished structure, which stood on the western side of the via Flaminia, was dedicated on 30th January 9 B.C.; cf. <u>*Fasti Praenestini*</u> (Degrassi 117) *Feriae ex s.c. quo(d eo) die ara Pacis Augusta(e in campo) Martio dedicata (e)st Druso et Crispino*, <u>*Fasti Verulani*</u> (Degrassi 161), <u>*Fasti Caeretani*</u> (Degrassi 65), Platner/Ashby 30–2, Steinby IV.70–4.

The structure itself consists of an altar surrounded by a wall, which is itself enclosed within larger precinct walls. On the inner precinct walls are sculpted sacrificial symbols in the form of crowned bucrania. The outer precinct walls are adorned with a variety of different images: processions of senators and the imperial family; Julian ancestors in the form of Aeneas, Romulus and Remus; most famously perhaps, the so-called 'Italia' or 'Tellus' relief, which shows a woman with babes amidst a rural Golden Age scene of peace and fertility; images of vines on the lower half of the outer walls sustain this sense of abundance and fertility. Taking into account the variety of imagery, the intended message of the Ara Pacis might well have been that a Golden Age of peace and prosperity had returned to Rome, and would remain so long as the imperial household were kept safe and proper respect and sacrifice offered to the gods. This message may have been amplified by the monument's ingenious interaction with the structures that surround it, especially Augustus' Mausoleum and the Horologium; for discussion of the structure and powerful symbolism of the altar, see Zanker (1988) 120–3, 158–60, 172, 175–6, 179–83, Elsner (1991), Favro (1996) 262–8.

ii. *A Eulogy of Augustan 'Peace' (711–18)?*

In choosing to celebrate this important Augustan monument on its dedication date, Ovid makes no mention of the occasion or the reasons for the altar. Moreover, little attention is given to the powerful visual display of the monument; but see (possibly) 716n. (*pompa*), 717n. (*Aeneadas*). Instead, Ovid's entry takes the form of a eulogy of peace.

A eulogy of peace is, in itself, nothing new, as it has a long tradition, particularly among Greek poets; cf. Bacch. fr. 4, Eur. *Bacch.* 413, *Supp.* 481, fr. 453 N., Ar. fr. 111 K., fr. 402 K., Philem. fr. 74 K., Tib. 1.10.45ff. It soon becomes clear, however, that Ovid is praising not the idealised peace of previous eulogies but, more specifically, Pax Augusta, the 'peace' established by the Emperor after Actium. Consequently, Ovid's entry contains elements which are quite new to eulogies of peace, such as the maintenance of arms (715) and military equipment (716), and a world order realised predominantly through fear (717–18).

Ovid's eulogy can be read as a positive and fitting conclusion to Book 1, in which a celebration of Augustan peace has been an underlying theme; see 3n., 657–704 (iii) n. Ovid's departure from the standard motifs of such eulogies can, moreover, be interpreted as a gesture towards reality: Roman peace meant subjugating potential trouble and engendering a sense of fear among its enemies. The Romans, it would seem, readily accepted this as part of the rhetoric of 'peace'; cf. e.g. Cic. *Sest.* 51, *Prov. Cons.* 30–1, Aug. *RG* 13 *parta victoriis pax*, Tac. *Hist.* 4.74, *Ag.* 30.4 (bitterly ironic), Gruen (1985) 51–63; also 717–18n.

A different reading is possible, however, if we take into account the striking and unique manner in which Ovid has chosen to celebrate Augustan peace. The fact that he has chosen to deal with Augustan peace within a framework usually reserved to explore idealised peace may be felt to cause uneasiness and create a persistent jarring effect; see esp. 715n., 716n., 717–18n. To the more cynical reader, Ovid's sentiments may in fact emphasise the *gulf* between real peace and the 'peace' proclaimed by Augustus. Furthermore, Ovid's insistence on the presence of arms, trumpets and fear has the effect of taking us far away from the 'Golden Age' serenity of the Ara Pacis; see Momigliano (1942b) 230. It is possible that Ovid is wittily playing about with opposing philosophies of 'peace' which are detectable even in the iconography of the monument itself; see Green (2004) 233–6.

709 ipsum nos carmen deduxit Pacis ad aram "The poem itself has led me down to the Altar of Peace": *deduco* could be taken in a (rare) metaphorical sense to denote the progression from one topic to another, i.e. the 'leading' into a new topic; cf. Cic. *Inv.* 1.97 *[oratio] quae . . . in aliam causam deducat.* Ovid's phraseology, however, encourages a more striking, personified image of the poem actually escorting the poet to the site of the Ara Pacis: the poem, it would seem, as well as the year, 'leads' Ovid to his immediate dealings with the event. This is the most striking example of simultaneity in *Fasti* between poem and year; for other examples, see 2n.

The juxtaposition of *carmen deduxit* may also pick up Callimachean poetics by encouraging us to see *Fasti* as a *carmen deductum*, the sort of poem, advocated by Callimachus, which shuns sustained loftiness and strong thematic unity in favour of variety and 'lightness' in both subject-matter and style; for the terminology, cf. *Met.* 1.4 *ad mea perpetuum deducite tempora carmen* (*Metamorphoses* will be both 'whole' and 'discursive'), Verg. *Ecl.* 6.4–5 *pastorem, Tityre, pinguis/pascere oportet ovis, deductum dicere carmen,* taken to be a close translation of Call. *Aet.* fr. 1.23–4 Pf. (Μοῦσαν . . . λεπταλέην); see esp. Hinds (1987) 18–21.

711–12 frondibus Actiacis comptos redimita capillos,/Pax, ades "May you be present, Peace, your combed locks wreathed with Actian foliage": the battle of Actium famously marked the end of the civil wars and the start of imperial peace. Consequently, Augustan Peace is here represented as wearing laurel, the traditional symbol of the victory at Actium; cf. e.g. *Met.* 1.562–3 *postibus Augustis eadem fidissima custos/ante fores stabis* (Apollo to laurel tree), *Tr.* 3.1.39–40, Aug. *RG* 16, Dio 53.16.4; for the symbolic use of laurel in general, see Bömer on 3.137.

711 redimita capillos: *capillos* is accusative of respect with *redimita*; for the idiom, see 407n. In fact, the verb is predominantly found in this idiom; cf. 3.269, 5.79 *neglectos hedera redimita capillos* (Calliope), 6.321, *Am.* 3.10.3 *tenues spicis redimita capillos* (Ceres), *Her.* 9.63, Verg. *A.* 3.81, Navarro-Antolín on Lygd. 4.23.

712 ades . . . mitis: the language of Roman prayer. *ades* is the standard formula for invoking a deity—cf. e.g. 67, 69, 3.2, 5.663, Appel (1909) 115ff.—and an appeal for mildness is also common; cf. 3.789, *Met.* 1.380, 4.31 *placatus mitisque . . . adsis* (Bacchus), 5.497, *Tr.* 1.10.46, Tib. 2.5.79, Appel (1909) 99.

713–14 "So long as enemies are absent, let also the motive for a triumph be absent: you will be a greater glory than war to leaders":

in a general sense, Ovid's call for man to cease his warring mentality and seek greater glory in the promotion of peace is consistent with previous eulogies of peace; cf. e.g. Eur. *Supp.* 486ff.

In the context of imperial Rome, however, Ovid's call for an end to foreign warfare seems, at first, a very bold move. It is, to be sure, rhetorically consistent with the policy of non-expansion of the empire bequeathed to Tiberius by Augustus in his funeral legacy; cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.11.4 *addideratque consilium coercendi intra terminos imperii*, Suet. *Aug.* 101.4, Dio 56.33.5. But this is widely viewed to have been a late-Augustan change in policy, though the reason for this change is unclear; see esp. T. J. Cornell (1993), "The end of Roman imperial expansion", in J. Rich and G. Shipley (eds.), *War and Society in the Roman World*, Routledge, 139–70. Indeed, during his career, Augustus seems to have been very proud of his foreign conquests in places such as Gaul, Spain and Egypt; cf. esp. Aug. *RG* 3.1, 26.2, 27.1, 30. So is Ovid's call an affront to the Roman military ethic? Not quite—Ovid cleverly predicates his call with the condition *dum desint hostes* (713): as the Romans are essentially responsible for deciding who or what is considered 'enemy', Ovid's sentiment allows them to wage 'legitimate' wars as before. Thus, there is no contradiction between these lines and Ovid's earlier celebration of Germanicus' (pending) triumph in Germany (see 285–6n.).

713 desit quoque causa triumphi: Ovid alludes to the widespread 'abuse' of ambitious Roman generals, who would wage wars simply to achieve a military triumph. A triumph brought with it not only the ceremonial trappings of the actual event but, more importantly, *gloria*; see Harris (1979) 17–32.

714 ducibus: for *dux* (applied to members of the imperial family), see 613n.

gloria is the standard term for the praise/renown achieved through performing a great deed for the state, particularly in the military sphere; cf. e.g. Cic. *Inv.* 2.166, *Phil.* 29 *est autem gloria laus recte factorum magnorumque in rem publicam fama meritorum*, *Tusc.* 3.3, Sal. *Cat.* 7.3–4, Harris (1979) 17–32. Ovid here suggests (or hopes) that a similar sense of *gloria* can be achieved through the opposite means, namely the maintenance of peace.

715 sola gerat miles, quibus arma coerceat, arma "let the soldier bear only weapons of such a kind with which to check (enemy) weapons": this is, in one sense, a realistic concession for the maintenance of Augustan peace; cf. esp. Tac. *Hist.* 4.74 *nam neque quies*

genitum sine armis (Cerialis to the Gauls). However, in a framework most commonly associated with praise of idealised peace, the sentiment is jarring: the object *arma* is delayed to the end of the line for shock effect. It represents a striking departure from previous praises of peace, which instead delight in the notion that peace renders all arms useless, causing them to rust away; cf. 4.928–30, Bacch. fr. 4.69–72, Eur. fr. 453 N., Theoc. *Id.* 16.96–7, Verg. *G.* 1.493–5, Hor. *S.* 2.1.43–4, Tib. 1.10.49–50 *pace bidens vomerque nitent, at tristia duri/militis in tenebris occupat arma situs* with Smith ad loc., Sen. *Thy.* 565–6; see also 709–22 (ii) n.

The close proximity of the anagrammatic pair *arma* (715) and *aram* (709) takes us back to the opening dichotomy at 13–14: the swift progression from discussion of an *aram* to talk of *arma* is a verbal expression of the blurred nature of this dichotomy; see 13–14n.

716 "Let nothing but a religious procession be sounded by the fierce trumpet": though he confines its usage to religious processions, Ovid nevertheless admits into the reign of Augustan peace a traditionally military implement—much hated for its capacity for causing sleepless nights to soldiers—whose *absence* in peacetime is often celebrated; cf. Bacch. fr. 4.75 χαλκεᾶν δ'οὐκ ἔστι σαλπίγγων κτύπος, Hor. *Epod.* 2.5, Tib. 1.1.4 with Smith ad loc., 1.10.11–12 *tunc mihi vita foret . . . nec audissem corde micante tubam* (Tibullus wishes for the peace which existed long ago), Sen. *Thy.* 574, Luc. 4.394–5, Plu. *Nic.* 9; see also 709–22 (ii) n.

canteturque: a rare example of *canto* used of the sounding of musical instruments: cf. Hor. *Ars* 414–15 *qui Pythia cantat/tibicen* (*Thes.* 3.289.77ff.); for *cano* used in this sense, cf. Var. *L.* 5.99, Vitr. 9.8.5, *Aetna* 298, *OLD* s.v. 5b.

fera . . . tuba: this striking collocation, only found here (*Thes.* 6.1.606.20), draws attention to the inappropriateness of the trumpet in times of peace.

pompa: as the sense requires a non-military procession (i.e. not a triumph), the *pompa* in question could be the one which accompanies either a religious festival or a funeral; for the festival procession, cf. e.g. 3.542 (Anna Perenna), Pl. *Cist.* 90 (festival of Dionysus), Verg. *G.* 3.22; for the funeral procession, cf. e.g. Cic. *Mil.* 33, Verg. *A.* 11.163 (Pallas). Both of these events might also make use of the trumpet; for use in the religious festival of the Tubilustrium, cf. e.g. 3.849, Var. *L.* 6.14, *OLD* s.v. 1b; in funerals, cf. Hor. *S.* 1.6.44, Prop. 4.11.9 (Cornelia), *OLD* s.v. 1c. Given that there is a sacrificial

procession sculpted on the Ara Pacis, it might well be to this type of procession that Ovid refers here.

717–18 Ovid prays for a world order achieved through fear of the Romans (*horreat*); the promotion of love for Rome is conceded as a last resort (718). The sentiment is not shocking in itself, as the Romans typically expressed their domination in terms of striking fear into others; cf. e.g. *Pont.* 1.2.125 *multa metu poenae . . . coercet* (Augustus), Verg. *A.* 6.798–800 *huius in adventum iam nunc et Caspia regna/responsis horrent divum et Maeotia tellus,/et septemgemini turbant trepida ostia Nili*, Hor. *Carm.* 3.3.45–56, *Saec.* 53–6. However, within the framework traditionally used to praise idealised peace, the promotion of fear over love is potentially another uncomfortable sentiment; see 709–22 (ii) n.

717 Aeneadas, strictly 'descendants of Aeneas', might refer specifically to the imperial family; for the identification of members of the imperial family on the Ara Pacis itself, see 709–22 (i) n. Alternatively, it might refer to all Romans; for this sense, cf. 4.161–2 *semper ad Aeneadas placido . . . voltu/respice* (Sibyl), *Met.* 15.682, Lucr. 1.1, Verg. *A.* 8.648, *Thes.* 1.984.8ff. Its usage here would then encourage the flattering image of a city united by a common ancestry.

primus et ultimus orbis "the first and last nation", i.e. "every nation": the phrase *primus et ultimus*, expressing not just first and last but everything within those parameters, is very rare; cf. Prop. 3.18.21 *primus et ultimus ordo* (everyone in the Underworld); the phrase is used differently at *Met.* 14.682 to refer to one and the same person. For *orbis* in the narrowed sense 'part of the world, i.e. country, nation', cf. e.g. *Her.* 1.58, *Met.* 1.94, 7.22, *Tr.* 1.2.85, 3.12.51 *ei mihi! iamne domus Scythico Nasonis in orbe est*, *Thes.* 9.2.917.78ff.

719–22 Ovid finishes with the sacrifice at the altar and a prayer for long life for the peace-giving imperial family. With a succession of commands and exhortations directed towards the priests—*addite* (719), *cadat* (720) and *rogate* (722)—Ovid briefly assumes the role of Master of Ceremony, a popular guise in representations of ritual proceedings; see 657–704 (ii) n.

719–20 Sacrifice was a very important visual and symbolic aspect of the Ara Pacis. The original senatorial dedication stipulated that magistrates, priests and Vestals make annual sacrifice at the altar (Aug. *RG* 12.2), and the Ara Pacis itself is loaded with religious and sacrificial imagery; see 709–22 (i) n. and, in general, Elsner (1991).

719 Pacalibus: *pacalis*, 'of/associated with peace', seems to be an Ovidian coinage used on three occasions by the poet (*Met.* 6.101,

15.591), and perhaps only once elsewhere; cf. Greg. M. *Ep.* 1.16b *quousque providentia dei et partes Italiae paceales* (*Thes.* 10.1.11.24ff.). It adds to the emphasis on peace in Book 1, as well as the innovative derivations from *pax*; see 3n.

720 albaque perfusa victima fronte cadat: following the general practice of antiquity, white victims were offered to heavenly deities such as Pax, whilst black victims were offered to the deities of the Underworld; cf. e.g. 56 *Idibus alba Iovi grandior agna cadit*, *Am.* 3.13.13ff., *Pont.* 4.9.49ff., Verg. *A.* 9.627ff., Navarro-Antolín on Lygd. 5.33. This colour is particularly appropriate to Peace, who is typically depicted as being clad in white; cf. *Ars* 3.502 *candida pax homines . . . decet*, Tib. 1.10.45, 67–8, Calp. *Ecl.* 1.54. The phrase *perfusa . . . fronte*, 'with forehead drenched', alludes to the practice of pouring wine on the victim's head before sacrifice; cf. 360, *Met.* 7.593–4, Verg. *A.* 4.60–1 with Pease ad loc., 6.243–4, *Thes.* 10.1.1423.52.

721–2 "and ask of the gods, who are favourably disposed to pious prayers, that the house which assumes responsibility for peace live forever with peace": this is a similar plea to 287—*Iane, fac aeternos pacem pacisque ministros*—and a final celebration of peace which has been a persistent theme in Book 1; see 3n., 657–704 (iii) n. The sentiment here is made with strong alliteration of 'p'—*praestat . . . pace perennet/ad pia propensos*—which perhaps strikes a more solemn note at the close of the book. More generally, a prayer for the nation is found elsewhere at the close of a book (cf. 4.953–4), and appears to have been a standard finale to a hymn or piece of panegyric; cf. e.g. Call. *Iov.* 90–5, *Cer.* 134–8, Hor. *Carm.* 1.35.29–32, Cat. 34.21–4, Men. Rh. 377.

721 domus "imperial house": see 532n.

perennet: equivalent to *perennis esse*, the verb seems to be an Ovidian coinage; cf. *Ars* 3.42 *arte perennat amor*, Man. 1.193, Col. 2.9.18, 4.33.1, 12.15.2, *Thes.* 10.1.1325.21ff.

722 ad pia propensos vota . . . deos: though similar in phraseology to Prop. 3.3.10—*versos ad pia vota deos*—the use of *propensus* is striking. The adjective, used twice elsewhere by Ovid (*Met.* 14.706, *Pont.* 3.4.15), is not used by other Augustan poets, and is rare in poetry in general. Furthermore, even when it is used, the metaphorical sense, 'favourably disposed', is rare; cf. Cic. *Off.* 2.69 *in eum fere est voluntas nostra propensior*, *Att.* 7.26.2, Liv. 42.5.2, V. Max. 1.8.2, *Thes.* 10.2.1975.71ff. Its usage here adds to the alliteration of 'p'.

723–4 By mentioning that the end of the book means the end of

the month, Ovid highlights the simultaneity which exists in *Fasti* between book and month; cf. 2.1 *cum carmine crescit et annus*, 863 *venimus in portum libro cum mense peracto*, *Tr.* 2.549–50 (724 = *Tr.* 2.550); see also 2n. On a more general level, such deliberate demarcation at the end of books is a popular feature of didactic literature; cf. e.g. *Ars* 1.771 *pars superat coepti, pars est exhausta laboris*, 2.745–6, Verg. *G.* 2.541–2, Man. 2.965–7.

723 exacta: originally used of physical constructions, *exigo* is first applied to the completion of a work of poetry by Horace; cf. Hor. *Carm.* 3.30.1 *exegi monumentum*, Prop. 3.1.8, Ov. *Rem.* 811, *Met.* 15.871 *iamque opus exegi*, *Thes.* 5.2.1464.53ff.

724 libellus, used particularly by Ovid and Martial, often refers to a book of poetry (see *Thes.* 7.2.1269.10ff.). Indeed, despite its diminutive form, Ovid appears to use the term to refer to any of his books, even those of considerable length; cf. *Am. Ep.* 1–2 *qui modo Nasonis fueramus quinque libelli/tres sumus*, *Rem.* 1 *legerat huius Amor titulum nomenque libelli*, *Tr.* 1.1.9, 1.7.19, 33 (referring to *Met.*), 2.549 (referring to *Fasti*), *Pont.* 1.1.3, *Ib.* 5 (possibly referring to *Ars*). It suggests that the diminutive *libellus* is, for Ovid, either a term of endearment or an attempt at modesty.

CUMQUE SUO FINEM MENSE LIBELLUS HABET

LIST OF REFERENCES

Editions

A list of the editions used (referred to by name only in the commentary).

Paley, F. A. (1854), *P. Ovidii Nasonis Fastorum Libri Sex*, London
Peter, H. (1907), *P. Ovidi Nasonis Fastorum Libri Sex*, Leipzig
Frazer, J. G. (1929), *The Fasti of Ovid Vol. I: Text and Translation*, London
—— (1929), *The Fasti of Ovid Vol. II: A Commentary on Books I and II*, London
—— (1989), *Ovid Fasti*, Harvard (Loeb Classical Library)
Bömer, F. (1957), *Ovid Die Fasten Band I*, Heidelberg
—— (1958), *Ovid Die Fasten Band II*, Heidelberg
Le Bonniec, H. (1961), *Ovide—Fasti I*, Paris
Pighi, I. B. (1973), *P. Ovidii Nasonis Fastorum Libri*, Turin
Alton, E. H., Wormell, D. E. W. and Courtney, E. (1988), *Ovidius Fasti*, Stuttgart (Teubner)
Schilling, R. (1992), *Ovide—Les Fastes Tome I, Livres I–III*, Paris
Nagle, B. R. (1995), *Ovid's Fasti: Roman Holidays*, Indianapolis
Canali, L. and Fucecchi, M. (1998), *Ovidio: I Fasti*, Milan
Boyle, A. J. and Woodard, R. D. (2000), *Ovid Fasti*, London (Penguin Classics)

Texts

References to certain fragmentary texts are accompanied by the name of or abbreviation for the relevant editor. A list of those abbreviations is given below.

Baehrens	Baehrens, A. (1881), *Poetae Latini Minores*, Leipzig
Card.	Cardauns, B. (1976), *Antiquitates Rerum Divinarum*,Wiesbaden
Courtney	Courtney, E. (1993), *The Fragmentary Latin Poets*, Oxford
Diels	Diels, H. (1951–60), *Die Fragmenta der Vorsokratiker*, Berlin
Goetz	Goetz, G. and Schoell, F. (1910), *M. Terenti Varronis De Lingua Latina quae supersunt: accedunt Grammaticorum Varronis Librorum Fragmenta*, Leipzig
J.	Jocelyn, H. D. (1967), *The Tragedies of Ennius: The Fragments*, Cambridge
K.	Kassel, R. and Austin, C. (1983–2001), *Poetae Comici Graeci*, Berlin
Kock	Kock, T. (1880–8), *Comicorum Atticorum Fragmenta*, Leipzig
L.	Lindsay, W. M. (1965), *Sexti Pompei Festi De verborum significatu quae supersunt cum Pauli epitome*, Hildesheim
Marx	Marx, F. (1904), *C. Lucilii Carminum Reliquiae*, Leipzig
N.	Nauck, A. (1889), *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, Leipzig
Peter	Peter, H. (1883), *Historicorum Romanorum Fragmenta*, Leipzig
Pf.	Pfeiffer, R. (1949), *Callimachus Vol. 1: Fragmenta*, Oxford
Ribbeck	Ribbeck, O. (1897–8), *Scaenicae Romanorum Poesis Fragmenta*, Leipzig
Rip.	Riposati, B. (1972), *M. Terenti Varronis De Vita Populi Romani*, Milan
Sk.	Skutsch, O. (1985), *The Annals of Q. Ennius*, Oxford
Vahlen	Vahlen, J. (1903), *Ennianae Poesis Reliquiae*, Leipzig

Other works cited

A list of important works used and referred to more than once. Articles/works of a more specialised nature, used solely for the purpose of one specific note, are fully referenced in the commentary note itself.

Adams, J. N. (1982), *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*, London
Adams, J. N. and Mayer, R. G. (eds.) (1999), *Aspects of the Language of Latin Poetry*, Oxford
Alton, E. H. (1922), "*Quaestiunculae Ovidianae*", *Hermathena* 19, 276–91
Alton, E. H., Wormell, D. E. W. and Courtney, E. (1973), "Problems in Ovid's *Fasti*", *CQ* 23, 144–51
André, J. (1949), *Étude sur les Termes de Couleur dans la Langue Latine*, Paris
—— (1956), *Lexique des Termes de Botanique en Latin*, Paris
—— (1981), *L'Alimentation et la Cuisine à Rome*, Paris
Appel, G. (1909), "De Romanorum precationibus", *Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten Band VII*, Giessen
Austin, R. (1964), *Aeneidos Liber Secundus*, Oxford
Axelson, B. (1945), *Unpoetische Wörter*, Lund
Bailey, C. (1910), *Lucretius on the Nature of Things*, Oxford
Barchiesi, A. (1991), "Discordant Muses", *PCPhS* 37, 1–21
—— (1997), *The Poet and the Prince*, California
—— (1997a), "Endgames: Ovid's *Metamorphoses* 15 and *Fasti* 6", in Roberts, D., Dunn, F. and Fowler, D. (eds.), *Classical Closure*, Princeton, 181–208
Barrett, A. (2002), *Livia: First Lady of Imperial Rome*, Yale
Barton, T. (1994), *Power and Knowledge: Astrology, Physiognomics and Medicine under the Roman Empire*, Michigan
—— (1995), "Augustus and Capricorn: Astrological Polyvalency and Imperial Rhetoric", *JRS* 85, 33–51
Beard, M. (1987), "A Complex of Times: No more Sheep on Romulus' Birthday", *PCPhS* 33, 1–15
Bömer, F. (1988), "Über das zeitliche Verhältnis zwischen den Fasten und den Metamorphosen Ovids", *Gymnasium* 95, 207–21
Boyle, A. J. (1997), "Postscripts from the Edge: Exilic *Fasti* and Imperialised Rome", *Ramus* 26, 7–28
—— (2003), *Ovid and the Monuments: A Poet's Rome*, Aureal
Brind'Amour, P. (1983), *Le Calendrier Romain: Recherches Chronologiques*, Ottawa
Brink, C. O. (1971), *Horace on Poetry: The Ars Poetica*, Cambridge
—— (1982), *Horace on Poetry: Epistles Book II*, Cambridge
Briscoe, J. (1973), *A Commentary on Livy, Books XXXI–XXXIII*, Oxford
Brown, R. D. (1987), *Lucretius on Love and Sex: A Commentary on De rerum natura IV, 1030–1287*, New York
Cairns, F. (1979), *Tibullus: A Hellenistic Poet at Rome*, Cambridge
Cameron, A. (1995), *Callimachus and his Critics*, New Jersey
Camps, W. A. (1969), *An Introduction to Virgil's Aeneid*, Oxford
Claassen, J.-M. (1999), *Displaced Persons: The Literature of Exile from Cicero to Boethius*, London
Clausen, W. V. (1994), *A Commentary on Virgil Eclogues*, Oxford
Coleman, R. (1977), *Virgil: Eclogues*, Cambridge
Cornell, T. J. (1995), *The Beginnings of Rome*, London
Courtney, E. (1980), *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal*, London
Crawford, M. H. (1974), *Roman Republican Coinage*, Cambridge
Debrohun, J. B. (1994), "Redressing Elegy's Puella: Propertius IV and the Rhetoric of Fashion", *JRS* 84, 41–63
Dickey, E. (2002), *Latin Forms of Address from Plautus to Apuleius*, Oxford
Dodds, E. R. (1960), *Euripides Bacchae*, Oxford

Duckworth, G. E. (1952), *The Nature of Roman Comedy: A Study in Popular Entertainment*, Princeton

Dumézil, G. (1970), *Archaic Roman Religion*, Chicago

Du Quesnay, I. M. (1977), "Vergil's Fourth *Eclogue*", *PLLS* vol. 1, 25–100

Eden, P. T. (1975), *A Commentary on Virgil: Aeneid VIII*, Mnemosyne Supplement 35

Edwards, C. (1993), *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome*, Cambridge

—— (1996), *Writing Rome: Textual Approaches to the City*, Cambridge

Elsner, J. (1991), "Cult and Sculpture: Sacrifice in the *Ara Pacis Augustae*", *JRS* 81, 50–61

Ernout, A., and Meillet, A. (1967), *Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue Latine: Histoire des Mots*, 4th edition, Paris

Fantham, E. (1983), "Sexual Comedy in Ovid's *Fasti*: Sources and Motivation", *HSPh* 87, 185–216

—— (1985), "Ovid, Germanicus and the Composition of the *Fasti*", *PLLS* vol. 5, 243–82

—— (1992a), "The Role of Evander in Ovid's *Fasti*", *Arethusa* 25, 155–71

—— (1992b), "Ceres, Liber and Flora: Georgic and Anti-Georgic elements in Ovid's *Fasti*", *PCPhS* 38, 39–56

—— (1995a), "Review Article: Recent Readings in Ovid's *Fasti*", *CPh* 90.4, 367–78

—— (1995b), "Rewriting and Rereading the *Fasti*: Augustus, Ovid and Recent Classical Scholarship", *Antichthon* 29, 42–59

—— (1998), *Ovid Fasti IV*, Cambridge

Favro, D. (1996), *The Urban Image of Augustan Rome*, Cambridge

Fedeli, P. (1980), *Propertius Sextus: Il Primo Libro delle Elegie*, Florence

—— (1985), *Properzio Il Libro Terzo delle Elegie*, Adriatic

Feeney, D. (1992), "*Si licet et fas est*: Ovid's *Fasti* and the Problem of Free Speech under the Principate", in Powell, A. (ed.), *Roman Poetry and Propaganda in the Age of Augustus*, Bristol, 1–25

—— (1998), *Literature and Religion at Rome*, Cambridge

Flobert, P. (1985), *Varron: La Langue Latine Livre VI*, Paris

Flory, M. B. (1984), "*Sic exempla parantur*: Livia's Shrine to Concordia and the Porticus Liviae", *Historia* 33, 309–30

—— (1998), "The Integration of Women into the Roman Triumph", *Historia* 47, 489–494

Fontenrose, J. (1959), *Python: A Study of Delphic Myth and its Origins*, California

Fordyce, C. J. (1977), *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Libri VII–VIII*, Oxford

Fowler, W. W. (1969), *The Roman Festivals of the Period of the Republic*, New York

Fränkel, H. (1945), *Ovid: A Poet between Two Worlds*, California

Frazel, T. D. (2002), "Ovid, *Fasti* 1.325–6 and 'Lamb Festivals'", *CPh* 97, 88–92

—— (2003), "Priapus' two rapes in Ovid's *Fasti*", *Arethusa* 36, 61–97

Frécaut, J. M. (1969), "Une Figure de Style chère à Ovide", *Latomus* 28, 28–41

—— (1972), *L'Esprit et l'Humour chez Ovide*, Grenoble

Gain, D. B. (1976), *The Aratus ascribed to Germanicus Caesar*, London

Gale, M. R. (2000), *Virgil on the Nature of Things: The Georgics, Lucretius and the Didactic Tradition*, Cambridge

Galinsky, K. (1966), "The Hercules-Cacus Episode in *Aeneid* VIII", *AJPh* 87, 18–51

—— (1972), *The Herakles Theme*, Oxford

—— (1975), *Ovid's Metamorphoses: An Introduction to the Basic Aspects*, Oxford

—— (1996), *Augustan Culture: An Interpretive Introduction*, Princeton

Gamel, M. K. (1989), "*Non sine caede*: Abortion Politics and Poetics in Ovid's *Amores*", *Helios* 16, 183–206

Gee, E. (2000), *Ovid, Aratus and Augustus: Astronomy in Ovid's Fasti*, Cambridge

—— (2002), "*Vaga Signa*: Orion and Sirius in Ovid's *Fasti*", in Herbert-Brown, G. (ed.), *Ovid's Fasti: Historical Readings at its Bimillenium*, Oxford, 47–70

George, E. V. (1974), *Aeneid VIII and the Aitia of Callimachus*, Mnemosyne Supplement 27

Gibson, R. K. (2003), *Ovid: Ars Amatoria III*, Cambridge
Goodyear, F. R. D. (1972), *The Annals of Tacitus, Books 1–6 Vol. 1: Annals 1.1–54*, Oxford
—— (1981), *The Annals of Tacitus, Books 1–6 Vol. 2: Annals 1.55–81 and 2*, Oxford
Gordon, R. (1990), "The Veil of Power: Emperors, Sacrificers and Benefactors", in Beard, M. and North, J. (eds.), *Pagan Priests: Religion and Power in the Ancient World*, London, 199–231
Gow, A. S. F. (1950), *Theocritus: Vol. II: Commentary*, Cambridge
Graf, F. (1998), 'Kalendae Ianuariae', *Ansichten griechischer Rituale: Geburtstag-Symposium für Walter Burkert*, Stuttgart, 199–216
Gransden, K. W. (1976), *Virgil Aeneid Book VIII*, Cambridge
Grant, M. (1975), *Erotic Art in Pompeii*, London
Green, S. J. (2000), "Multiple Interpretation of the Opening and Closing of the Temple of Janus: a Misunderstanding of Ovid *Fasti* 1.281", *Mnemosyne* 53, 302–9
—— (2001), "*Docens Poeta*: Development of the Interviewer's Skills in Ovid's *Fasti*", *Latomus* 60, 603–12
—— (2004) "Playing with Marble: Monuments of the Caesars in Ovid's *Fasti*", *CQ* 54, 224–39
Gruen, E. (1985), "Augustus and the Ideology of War and Peace", in Winkes, R. (ed.), *The Age of Augustus*, Providence, 51–72
Hardie, P. R. (1986), *Virgil's Aeneid: Cosmos and Imperium*, Oxford
—— (1991), "The Janus Episode in Ovid's *Fasti*", *MD* 26, 47–64
—— (1992), "Augustan Poets and the Mutability of Rome", in Powell, A. (ed.), *Roman Poetry and Propaganda in the Age of Augustus*, Bristol, 59–82
—— (2002), *Ovid's Poetics of Illusion*, Cambridge
Harmon, D. P. (1978), "The Public Festivals of Rome", *ANRW* II.16.2, 1440–1468
—— (1986), "Religion in the Latin Elegists", *ANRW* II.16.3, 1909–73
Harries, B. (1989), "Causation and the Authority of the Poet in Ovid's *Fasti*", *CQ* 38, 164–85
Harris, W. (1979), *War and Imperialism in Republican Rome 327–70 B.C.*, Oxford
Harrison, S. J. (1991), *Virgil: Aeneid 10*, Oxford
—— (2002), "Ovid and Genre: Evolutions of an Elegist" in Hardie, P. (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, Cambridge, 79–94
Headlam, W. G. (1922), *Herodas: the Mimes and Fragments*, Cambridge
Heinze, R. (1919), *Ovids Elegische Erzählung*, Leipzig
Herbert-Brown, G. (1994), *Ovid and the Fasti: An Historical Study*, Oxford
—— (2002) (ed.), *Ovid's Fasti: Historical Readings at its Bimillenium*, Oxford
—— (2002a), "Ovid and the Stellar Calendar", in Herbert-Brown, G. (ed.), *Ovid's Fasti: Historical Readings at its Bimillenium*, Oxford, 101–28
Herescu, N. I. (1958), "L'Edition Antique des Poètes Latins", *REL* 36, 132–59
Herter, H. (1932), "De Priapo", *Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten Band XXIII*, Giessen
Hinds, S. J. (1987), *The Metamorphosis of Persephone: Ovid and the self-conscious Muse*, Cambridge
—— (1992), "*Arma* in the *Fasti*", *Arethusa* 25, 81–153
—— (1998), *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*, Cambridge
Hofmann, J. B. (1951), *Lateinische Umgangssprache*, Heidelberg
Holland, L. A. (1961), *Janus and the Bridge*, American Academy in Rome
Hollis, A. S. (1977), *Ars Amatoria Book I*, Oxford
Holzberg, N. (2002), *Ovid: The Poet and his Work*, Cornell
Hooper, R. W. (1999), *The Priapus Poems: Erotic Epigrams from Ancient Rome*, Illinois
Ideler, J. (1825), "Über den Astronomischen Teil der *Fasti* des Ovid", *Abhandlungen der königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin 1822–3*, Berlin, 137–69

Janan, M. W. (2001), *The Politics of Desire: Propertius IV*, California
Janka, M. (1997), *Ovid: Ars Amatoria—Buch 2: Kommentar*, Heidelberg
Johnson, P. J. (1997), "Ovid's Livia in Exile" *CW* 90, 403–20
Johnson, W. R. (1978), "The Desolation of the *Fasti*", *CJ* 74, 7–18
Kapparis, K. A. (2002), *Abortion in the Ancient World*, London
Kellum, B. (1990), "The City Adorned: Programmatic Display at the *Aedes Concordiae Augustae*", in Raaflaub, K. and Toher, M. (eds.), *Between Republic and Empire: Interpretations of Augustus and His Principate*, California, 276–307
Kenney, E. J. (1969), "Ovid and the Law", *Yale Classical Studies* 21, 241–63
—— (2002), "Ovid's Language and Style", in Boyd, B.W. (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Ovid*, Leiden, 27–89
Kidd, D. A. (1997), *Aratus Phaenomena*, Cambridge
Knox, P. E. (1986), *Ovid's Metamorphoses and the Traditions of Augustan Poetry*, Cambridge
—— (1995), *Ovid Heroides: Select Epistles*, Cambridge
Kovacs, D. (1993), "A Spurious Addition to Ovid's *Fasti*", *CJ* 88, 187–190
Kuttner, A. (1995), *Dynasty and Empire in the Age of Augustus: The Case of the Boscoreale Cups*, California
Lacey, W. K. (1996), *Augustus and the Principate: the Evolution of the System*, Leeds
Le Bonniec, H. (1958), *Le Culte de Cérès à Rome*, Paris
—— (1960), "Notes Critiques sur les *Fastes* d' Ovide", *RPh* 34, 194–215
Le Boueffle, A. (1975), *Germanicus: Les Phénomènes d'Aratus*, Paris
Lefèvre, E. (1976), "Die Lehre von der Entstehung der Tieropfer in Ovids *Fasten*", *RhM* 119, 39–64
Le Gall, J. (1953), *Le Tibre Fleuve de Rome dans l'Antiquité*, Paris
Levick, B. (1972), "Tiberius' Retirement to Rhodes in 6 B.C.", *Latomus* 31, 779–813
—— (1978), "Concordia at Rome", in Carson, R. and Kraay, C. (eds.), *Scripta Nummaria Romana: Essays presented to Humphrey Sutherland*, London, 217–33
Linderski, J. (1986), "The Augural Law", *ANRW* II.16.3, 2146–312
Little, D. (1970), "Richard Heinze: Ovids elegische Erzählung", in Zinn, E. (ed.), *Ovids Ars amatoria und Remedia amoris: Untersuchungen zum Aufbau*, Stuttgart, 64–105
Littlewood, R. J. (2002), "*imperii pignora certa*: The Role of Numa in Ovid's *Fasti*", in Herbert-Brown, G. (ed.), *Ovid's Fasti: Historical Readings at its Bimillennium*, Oxford, 175–97
Loehr, J. (1996), *Ovids Mehrfacherklärungen in der Tradition aitiologischen Dichtens*, Leipzig
Luck, G. (1967), *Tristia: herausgegeben, übersetzt und erklärt von Georg Luck*, Heidelberg
Lucke, C. (1982), *P. Ovidius Naso Remedia Amoris: Kommentar zur Vers 397–814*, Bonn
McGushin, P. (1977), *C. Sallustius Crispus: Bellum Catilinae: A Commentary*, Leiden
McKeown, J. C. (1979), "Augustan Elegy and Mime", *PCPhS* 25, 71–84
—— (1984), "*Fabula proposito nulla tegenda meo*: Ovid's *Fasti* and Augustan Politics", in Woodman, T. and West, D. (eds.), *Poetry and Politics in the Age of Augustus*, Cambridge, 169–87
—— (1989), *Ovid: Amores, Vol. II: A Commentary on Book One*, Leeds
—— (1998), *Ovid: Amores, Vol. III: A Commentary on Book Two*, Leeds
Maltby, R. (2002), *Tibullus Elegies: Text, Introduction and Commentary*, Leeds
Mankin, D. (1995), *Horace Epodes*, Cambridge
Marquis, E. (1973), "Propertius 4.1.150 and the Gate of Cancer", *WS* 86, 126–33
Martin, C. (1985), "A Reconsideration of Ovid's *Fasti*", *ICS* 10, 261–74
Martin, E. W. (1914), *The Birds of the Latin Poets*, California
Merli, E. (2000), *Arma canant alii: Materia Epica e Narrazione Elegiaca nei Fasti di Ovidio*, Florence
Meslin, M. (1970), *La Fête des Kalendes de Janvier dans l'Empire Romain*, Brussels
Michels, A. (1967), *The Calendar of the Roman Republic*, Princeton
Millar, F. (1973), "Triumvirate and Principate", *JRS* 63, 50–67

—— (1993), "Ovid and the *Domus Augusta*: Rome seen from Tomoi", *JRS* 83, 1–18
Miller, J. F. (1980), "Ritual Directions in Ovid's *Fasti*: Dramatic Hymns and Didactic Poetry", *CJ* 75, 204–14
—— (1982), "Callimachus and the Augustan Aetiological Elegy", *ANRW* II.30.1, 371–417
—— (1983), "Ovid's Divine Interlocutors in the *Fasti*", *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History III*, Brussels, 156–92
—— (1991), *Ovid's Elegiac Festivals*, Frankfurt
—— (1992a), "Introduction: Research on Ovid's *Fasti*", *Arethusa* 25, 1–10
—— (1992b), "The *Fasti* and Hellenistic didactic: Ovid's Variant Aetiologies", *Arethusa* 25, 11–31
—— (2002), "The *Fasti*: Style, Structure and Time", in Boyd, B.W. (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Ovid*, Leiden, 167–96
Miller, J. I. (1969), *The Spice Trade of the Roman Empire*, Oxford
Momigliano, A. (1942a), "Camillus and Concord", *CQ* 36, 111–20
—— (1942b), "The Peace of the Ara Pacis", *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 5, 228–31
Morgan, L. (1998), "Assimilation and Civil War: Hercules and Cacus", in Stahl, H.-P. (ed.), *Vergil's Aeneid: Augustan Epic and Political Context*, London, 175–98
—— (1999), *Patterns of Redemption in Virgil's 'Georgics'*, Cambridge
Murgatroyd, P. (1980), *Tibullus Elegies I*, Natal
—— (1994), *Tibullus Elegies II*, Oxford
Myers, K. S. (1994), *Ovid's Causes: Cosmogony and Aetiology in the Metamorphoses*, Michigan
Mynors, R. A. B. (1990), *Virgil Georgics*, Oxford
Navarro-Antolín, F. (1996), *Lygdamus: Corpus Tibullianum III. 1–6, Lygdami elegiarum liber*, Leiden
Nethercut, W. R. (1968), "Elegiac Technique in Prop. 4.1.71–150", *WS* 81, 92–7
—— (1970), "The Astrological Significance of Propertius 4.1.150", *WS* 83, 110–17
Newlands, C. E. (1995), *Playing with Time: Ovid and the Fasti*, New York
—— (2000), "Connecting the Disconnected: Reading Ovid's *Fasti*", in Sharrock, A. and Morales, H. (eds.), *Intratextuality: Greek and Roman Textual Relations*, Oxford, 171–202
—— (2002), "*Mandati memores*: Political and Poetic Authority in the *Fasti*", in Hardie, P. (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, Cambridge, 200–16
Newman, J. K. (1967), *Augustus and the New Poetry*, Brussels
Nisbet, R. G. M. and Hubbard, M. (1970), *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book I*, Oxford
—— (1978) *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book II*, Oxford
Norden, E. (1926), *Vergilius Aeneis Buch VI*, Leipzig
—— (1956), *Agnostos Theos*, Stuttgart
Oakley, S. P. (1998), *A Commentary on Livy Books VI–X*, Oxford
O'Connor, E. M. (1989), *Symbolicum Salacitatis: A Study of the God Priapus as a Literary Character*, Frankfurt
Ogilvie, R. M. (1965), *A Commentary on Livy Books 1–5*, Oxford
O'Hara, J. J. (1996), *True Names: Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay*, Michigan
Otis, B. (1970), *Ovid as an Epic Poet*, Cambridge
Otto, A. (1890), *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer*, Leipzig
Owen, S. G. (1924), *P. Ovidi Nasonis Tristium Liber Secundus*, Oxford
Palmer, A. (1898), *Heroides*, Oxford
Parker, H. (1997), *Greek Gods in Italy in Ovid's Fasti: A Greater Greece*, Lampeter
Parry, H. (1964), "Ovid's *Metamorphoses*: Violence in a Pastoral Landscape", *TAPhA* 95, 268–82
Pasco-Pranger, M. (2000), "*Vates Operosus*: Vatic Poetics and Antiquarianism in Ovid's *Fasti*", *CW* 93, 275–91

—— (2002a), "Added Days: Calendrical Poetics and the Julio-Claudian Holidays", in Herbert-Brown, G. (ed.), *Ovid's Fasti: Historical Readings at its Bimillenium*, Oxford, 251–74
—— (2002b), "A Varronian Vatic Numa?: Ovid's *Fasti* and Plutarch's Life of Numa", in Levene, D. and Nelis, D. (eds.), *Clio and the Poets: Augustan Poetry and the Traditions of Ancient Historiography*, Leiden, 291–312
Pease, A. S. (1955–8), *M. Tulli Ciceronis De Natura Deorum*, Harvard
—— (1967), *Aeneidos Liber Quartus*, Harvard
—— (1973), *M. Tulli Ciceronis De Divinatione*, Illinois
Peeters, F. (1939), *Les Fastes d'Ovide: Histoire du Texte*, Brussels
Phillips, C. R. (1992), "Roman Religion and Literary Studies in the *Fasti*", *Arethusa* 25, 55–80
Pichon, R. (1991), *Index Verborum Amatoriorum*, Darmstadt
Platnauer, M. (1951), *Latin Elegiac Verse*, Cambridge
Porte, D. (1985), *L'Étiologie religieuse dans les Fastes d'Ovide*, Paris
Pouthier, P. (1981), *Ops et la Conception Divine de l'Abondance dans la Religion Romaine jusqu'à la Mort d'Auguste*, Paris
Powell, J. G. F. (1988), *Cato Maior de senectute*, Cambridge
Rawson, E. (1985), *Intellectual Life in the Late Roman Republic*, Duckworth
Reece, S. (1993), *The Stranger's Welcome*, Michigan
Reeson, J. (2001), *Ovid Heroides 11, 13 & 14: A Commentary*, Leiden
Rich, J. W. and Williams, J. H. C. (1999), "*Leges et Iura P.R. Restituit*: A New Aureus of Octavian and the Settlement of 28–27 B.C.", *Numismatic Chronicle* 159, 169–213
Richlin, A. (1983), *The Garden of Priapus: Sexuality and Aggression in Roman Humor*, Yale
—— (1992), "Reading Ovid's Rapes", in Richlin, A. (ed.), *Pornography and Representation in Greece and Rome*, Oxford, 158–79
Rizzo, G. E. (1929), *La Pittura Ellenistico-Romana*, Milan
Robinson, M. (2000), *Prolegomena to the Study of Ovid's Fasti with Commentary on Book 2.1–532*, D.Phil. Thesis, Oxford
Rüpke, J. (1994), "Ovids Kalenderkommentar: zur Gattung der *Libri Fastorum*", *A&A* 40, 125–36
Rutledge, E. S. (1980a), "Virgil and Ovid on the Tiber", *CJ* 75, 301–4
—— (1980b), "Ovid's Informants in the *Fasti*", *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History II*, Brussels, 322–31
Sauvage, A. (1975), *Étude de Thèmes Animaliers dans la Poésie Latine*, Brussels
Scheid, J. (1992), "Myth, Cult and Reality in Ovid's *Fasti*", *PCPhS* 38, 118–31
Schilling, R. (1960), "Janus: le Dieu Introducteur, le Dieu des Passages", *MEFR* 72, 89–131
Schubert, W. (1991), "Zur Sage von Hercules und Cacus bei Vergil (*Aen.* 8.184–279) und Ovid (*Fast.* 1.543–586)", *JAC* 6, 37–60
—— (1992), *Die Mythologie in den nichtmythologischen Dichtungen Ovids*, Frankfurt
—— (1999), *Ovid Werk und Wirkung: Festgabe für Michael von Albrecht zum 65. Geburtstag*, Frankfurt
Scott, K. (1930), "Emperor Worship in Ovid", *TAPhA* 61, 43–69
Scourfield, J. H. D. (1993), *Consoling Heliodorus: A Commentary on Jerome, Letter 60*, Oxford
Scullard, H. H. (1981), *Festivals and Ceremonies of the Roman Republic*, London
Shea, C. (1988), "The Vertumnus Elegy and Propertius IV", *ICS* 13, 63–71
Simpson, C. J. (1991), "Livia and the Constitution of the *Aedes Concordiae*: the Evidence of Ovid *Fasti* 1.637ff.", *Historia* 40, 449–55
—— (1994), "*Reddita omnis provincia*: Ratification by the People in January 27 B.C.", in Deroux, C. (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History VII*, Brussels, 297–309
Skutsch, O. (1985), *The Annals of Q. Ennius*, Oxford
Small, J. P. (1982), *Cacus and Marsyas in Etrusco-Roman Legend*, Princeton

Smith, K. F. (1964), *The Elegies of Albius Tibullus*, Darmstadt
Sorabji, R. (1993), *Animal Minds and Human Morals: The Origins of the Western Debate*, London
Spaeth, B. (1996), *The Roman Goddess Ceres*, Texas
Spurr, M. S. (1986), *Arable Cultivation in Roman Italy c. 200 B.C.–c. A.D. 100*, Journal of Roman Studies Monographs, no. 3
Stahl, H.-P. (1985), *Propertius 'Love' and 'War': Individual and State under Augustus*, California
Stroh, W. (1991), "*De amore senili quid ueteres poetae senserint*", *Gymnasium* 98, 264–276
Sutherland, C. H. V. (1974), *Roman Coins*, London
Syme, R. (1978), *History in Ovid*, Oxford
Tarrant, R. J. (1976), *Seneca Agamemnon*, Cambridge
—— (1983), "Ovid: *Fasti*", in Reynolds, L. (ed.), *Texts and Transmission*, Oxford, 266–8
—— (1985), *Seneca's Thyestes*, Atlanta
Thibault, J. C. (1964), *The Mystery of Ovid's Exile*, California
Thomas, R. F. (1991), "The 'Sacrifice' at the End of the *Georgics*, Aristaeus, and Vergilian Closure", *CPh* 86, 211–18
Tissol, G. (1997), *The Face of Nature: Wit, Narrative and Cosmic Origins in Ovid's Metamorphoses*, Princeton
Toohey, P. (1996), *Epic Lessons: An Introduction to Ancient Didactic Poetry*, London
Tupet, A. M. (1976) *La Magie dans la Poésie Latine I: Des Origines à la Fin du Règne d'Auguste*, Paris
Turcan, R. (1981), "Janus à l'Époque Impériale", *ANRW* II.16.1, 374–402
Van Dam, H.-J. (1984), *Silvae Book II: A Commentary*, Leiden
Verdière, R. (1992), *Le Secret du Voltigeur d'Amor ou le Mystère de la Relégation d'Ovide*, Brussels
Versnel, H. S. (1970), *Triumphus: an Inquiry into the Origin, Development, Meaning of the Roman Triumph*, Leiden
Volk, K. (1997), "*Cum carmine crescit et annus*: Ovid's *Fasti* and the Poetics of Simultaneity", *TAPhA* 127, 287–313
—— (2001), "Pious and Impious Approaches to Cosmology in Manilius", *MD* 47, 85–117
—— (2002), *The Poetics of Latin Didactic: Lucretius, Vergil, Ovid, Manilius*, Oxford
Von Albrecht, M. (1964), *Die Parenthese in Ovids Metamorphosen und ihre dichterische Funktion*, Hildesheim
Wallace-Hadrill, A. (1987), "Time for Augustus: Ovid, Augustus and the *Fasti*", in Whitby, M., Hardie, P. and Whitby, M. (eds.), *Homo Viator: Classical Essays for John Bramble*, Bristol, 221–30
West, M. L. (1966), *Hesiod Theogony*, Oxford
Wheeler, S. M. (1999), *A Discourse of Wonders: Audience and Performance in Ovid's Metamorphoses*, Philadelphia
White, K. D. (1970), *Roman Farming*, London
White, P. (1993), *Promised Verse: Poets in the Society of Augustan Rome*, Harvard
—— (2002), "Ovid and the Augustan Milieu", in Boyd, B. W. (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Ovid*, Leiden, 1–25
Wiedemann, T. (1975), "The Political Background to Ovid's *Tristia* 2", *CQ* 25, 264–71
Wilkinson, L. P. (1955), *Ovid Recalled*, Cambridge
—— (1966), *Golden Latin Artistry*, Cambridge
Williams, G. D. (1991), "Vocal Variations and Narrative Complexity in Ovid's Vestalia: *Fasti* 6.249–468", *Ramus* 20, 183–204
—— (1994), *Banished Voices: Readings in Ovid's Exile Poetry*, Cambridge
—— (2002), "Ovid's Exilic Poetry: Worlds Apart" in Boyd, B.W. (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Ovid*, Leiden, 337–81
Williams, R. D. (1962), *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Tertius*, Oxford

Wills, J. (1996), *Repetition in Latin Poetry: Figures of Allusion*, Oxford
Wiseman, T. P. (1988), "Satyrs in Rome? The Background to Horace's *Ars Poetica*", *JRS* 78, 1–13
—— (2002), "Ovid and the Stage", in Herbert-Brown, G. (ed.), *Ovid's Fasti: Historical Readings at its Bimillennium*, Oxford, 275–99
Wissowa, G. (1912) *Religion und Kultus der Römer*, Munich
Witt, R. E. (1971), *Isis in the Graeco-Roman World*, London
Wormell, D. E. W. (1979), "Ovid and the *Fasti*", *Hermathena* 27, 39–50
Wünsch, R. (1901), "Zu Ovids *Fasten* Buch I und II", *RhM* 56, 392–403
Wyke, M. (1987), "Written Women: Propertius' *scripta puella*", *JRS* 77, 47–61
Zanker, P. (1988), *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, Michigan

INDICES

* Other than references to the two introductory chapters, which are by page number, references are to the individual notes in the commentary.

1. LATIN AND GREEK WORDS AND PHRASES

ambarvalia: 669n.
abducere: 451n.
accendere: 76n.
accipe: 115n.
acervus: 106n.
actor: 547n.
actus: 323n.
ad .. ire: 431–2n.
ades: 67n., 712n.
adnuere: 15–16n.
adolere: 276n.
adplicare: 543n.
adulterare: 373n.
adurere: 680n.
aegra seges: 688n.
Aeneadae: 717n.
aequorea aqua: 340n.
aequoreus senex: 372n.
aes: 221n.
aetheria aqua: 682n.
aetherius: 473n.
Agnalia: 325–6n.
ago, -nis: 319n.
agone?: 322n.
agonia: 331n.
Alcides: 575n.
alimentum: 214n.
alites: 448n.
alligare: 372n.
ambitio: 303n.
ambulare (+ acc.): 122n.
amicitia: 218n.
amor habendi: 195n.
anceps: 95n.
animam ponere: 383n.
animum sumere: 147n.
annales: 7n.
annos augeat: 613n.
Aonius: 490n.
aperire: 681n.
apertum caelum: 681n.
ara: 13–14n.
arator: 698n.
aratro renovare: 159n.
arma: 13–14n., 22n., 29n., 261n., 715n.
arma movere: 277n.
armilla: 261n.
ars: 23–4n.
as (aes signatum): 229–54n.
ater: 58n.
auctoritas: 612n.
auctus: 612n.
**aug-*: 611–12n., 611n., 612n.
augurium: 611n.
Augusti: 531n.
augustus: 611n.
aures advertere: 179n.
Ausonius: 55n.
auspex: 615n.
auspicium: 646n.
auxiliaris: 602n.
avaritia: 213–14n.
avena: 692n.
avidus: 677n.
avis/ ales: 513n.

biceps: 65n.
biformis: 89n.
bina: 144n.
blandus: 157n.
bona verba: 72n.
bruma: 163n., 394n.

Cacus: 552n.
caducus: 181–2n.
caecus ictus: 623n.
caeles: 236n.
caelestis aula: 139n.
caelestis ros: 312n.
caerul(e)us: 365n.
Caesar: 3n.
Caesareum numen: 282n.
Caesareus: 282n.
callidus: 268n.
candidus (mel): 186n.
candidus (templum): 70n.
canere: 1–2 (iii) n., 2n., 716n.
cantare: 716n.
Capitolium: 203n.
caput exserere: 300n.
cardinem vertere: 120n.
carica: 185–6n.
carmen deductum: 709n.
carpentum: 619n., 620n.

casa: 502n.
casa Romuli: 199n.
castus: 587n.
causa: 674n.
causae: pp. 2, 10, 11, 12
causam reddere: 278n.
cera: 591n.
Cerialia rura: 683n.
Clarius: 20n.
claviger (clava): 544n.
claviger (clavis): 228n.
Clusius: 129–30n.
collum praebere: 83n.
com- (verbs): 362n.
commerere: 362n.
componere: 708n.
concentus: 155n.
concipere: 182n.
concolor: 80n.
concordia/ Concordia: 637–50 (i) n.
conditor Urbis: 27n.
conferre: 162n.
confugere: 572n.
coniunx: 334n.
conlabefactare: 566n.
consulere: 180n.
corona: 345n.
corpora: 105n.
corrigere: 675n.
corripere: 625n.
corymbifer: 393n.
costum: 341n.
crede mihi: 496n.
credibile est: 299n.
crimen habere: 445n.
crocus: 342n.
cultus: 678n.
currere: 652n.

da: 17n.
damnum: 60n.
Dardanius: 519n.
de (partitive): 190n.
decus et tutela/ tutamen: 415n.
deducere: 709n.
delibare: 169n.
dentes premere/ imprimere: 355n.
dependere: 611n.
depopulari: 684n.
descendere: 537n.
devotus: 6n.
dexter ades: 67n.
dextra conferre: 569n.
dic age: 149n.
dies: 232n.
dies atri: 57–60n.
dies comitiales: 53n.
dies fasti: 48n.
dies nefasti: 47n.
difficilis: 146n.
digerere: 1n.
dignus + inf.: 226n.
disce: 101n.
dissuere: 408n.
(in) diversa: 283n.
dividuus: 292n.
divitiae: 690n.
doctus princeps: 19–20n.
doctus vates: 499–500n.
domus: 108n.
domus Augusta: 532n.
ducere: 317n.
dulcis: 188n.
dux: 613n.

ebur: 82n.
effervere: 379n.
egressus: 138n.
eiaculari: 270n.
elicere: 255–6n.
emeritus: 665n.
en + imperative: 6n.
Eous/ Hesperius: 140n.
eripere: 621n.
errare: 468n.
error: 32n.
eruere: 7n.
Erytheis: 543n.
esse alicui cum aliquo: 253n.
esse hospitium: 545n.
est aliquid: 484n.
Evander: 552n.
exanimatus: 630n.
excipere: 3n.
excutere: 624n.
exigere: 723n.
exta: 51n.
extenuare: 232n.

facilis: 146n.
facundia: 21n.
falcifer: 234n.
fallor an: 515n.
fames: 304n.
famulus: 286n.
far: 337–8n.
fas: 25n., 329n., 532n.
fasces: 81n.

fastus, -a, -um: 48n.
fastus, -us: 419n.
fatum: 479n., 481n.
felix annus: 26n.
felix qui: 297n.
fenore reddere: 694n.
fenum: 206n.
fera tuba: 716n.
feriae conceptivae: 659–60n.
festa domestica: 9n.
festum: 190n.
fictilia: 202n.
fides: 359n.
filum: 342n.
firmare: 497n.
flatus: 428n.
flos: 345n.
flumen: 24n.
fontanus: 269n.
fortuna: 479n.
fragor: 567n.
frigora: 149n.
frons: 135n.
fulgur: 574n.
furta: 560n.
furtim: 425n.

gaudere/ gaudium: 431n.
geminus: 370n.
-gena: 199n.
generosus: 591n.
genetrix: 479n., 649n.
Germanicus: 3n.
gloria: 303n., 714n.
gradus (ferre): 638n.
grates agere: 147n.
gravidus: 671–2n.

habena: 25n.
haerere: 61n.
harenosus: 241–2n.
Hellespontiacus: 440n.
herba: 154n.
herba Sabina: 343n.
Hesperia: 498n.
Hesperius: see *Eous*
hic ... ille (rule reversal): 674n.
honoratus: 52n.
Horae: 125n.
horrere: 495n.
hospita navis: 340n.
hospita terra/ tellus: 511n.
hostia: 335–6n., 336n.
hostis: 359n.
hydrops: 215n.
Hyperion: 385n.

iacere: 218n., 662n.
ianitor: 138n.
idem + gen.: 46n.
idulis ovis: 56n.
Idus: 56n., 587n.
ignotus: 157n.
immensus: 677n.
immolare: 579n.
imperium: 613n.
impetus: 23n.
in + abl. (temporal): 495n.
in + past participle (adj.): 546n.
in fato/ fatis esse: 481n.
in idem: 395n.
in parte esse: 293n.
in pretio esse: 217n.
incaeduus: 243n.
incendium: 411n.
incustoditus: 546n.
index: 450n.
inesse: 178n.
inexstinctus: 413n.
infamia: 551n.
ingenium: 18n., 23–4n.
innocuus: 442n.
instare: 315n.
intactus: 79n.
intempestivus: 434n.
introitus: 138n.
intumescere: 215n.
invidiosus: 266n.
iocus: 396n.
ira numinis: 483n.
irridere: 420n.
Isaurus: 593–4n.
iter + gen.: 262n.
iter emetiri: 544n.
iura dare: 38n.
iura reddere: 252n.

labare: 190n.
labi (signa): 2n.
labi (tempus): 65n.
labor militiae: 302n.
lacrimare: 339n.
lam(m)ina: 208n.
laniger: 334n.
Lar/ lar: 136n.
Latium: 237–8n.
Latius: 1n.
lautus: 454n.
lege agere: 48n.
letifer: 123n.

levis: 5n., 261n., 303n., 552n.
libellus: 724n.
Liber: 403n.
libido: 413n.
librare: 429n.
libum: 670n.
linguis (animisque) favete: 71n.
lolium: 691n.
lucidus aer: 105n.
Lucifer: 46n.
lucrum: 194n.
lustratio agri: 669n.
luteus: 158n.
luxuria: 213–14n.
luxuriare: 156n.
luxuriosus: 690n.
Lyaeus: 395n.

macies: 689n.
mactare: 377n.
madidus: 271n.
Maenalus: 634n.
maiestas: 224n.
male: 559n.
malum: 552n.
mane erat: 547n.
manere + dat.: 237n.
manus/ palmas pandere: 645–6n.
manus porrigere: 645–6n.
maritus: 451n.
Martigena: 199n.
massa: 108n.
mater (Ceres/ Tellus): 671n.
maximus orbis: 600n.
me miserum: 598n.
membra: 112n.
mente agitare: 93n.
mente percipere: 102n.
meritum: 483n.
merum: 172n.
metari: 309n.
metus excutere: 16n.
minister: 319n.
miscere: 123n.
mittere: 341n.
moenia: 515n.
moles: 568n.
moneta: 222n.
monitus: 227n.
monstrum: 554n.
motus: 475n.
mugitum dare/ edere: 560n.
Mulciber: 554n.

Naides: 405n.
nasci: 167n.
nec mora: 278n.
nec putaris: 49n.
nequitia: 414n.
nihil agere: 571n.
nihil iuvare: 445n.
nimium quoque: 437n.
niveus: 427n., 637n.
non levis: 552n.
Nonae: 57n.
nondum: 339n.
nota/ notare: 8n.
nota: 418n., 596n.
novare: 621–2n.
novissimus: 163n.
nox erat: 421n.
noxae dare: 359n.
num minus: 526n.
nuncupare: 246n.
nutus: 70n., 418n.

obdere: 281n.
obire: 464n.
obscena pars: 437n.
obvius ire/ venire: 500n.
octipes: 311–14 (v) n.
Oebalius: 260n.
officium: 5–6n.
officium tueri: 673n.
olim: 517n.
onus: 624n.
opes: 350n.
opus movere: 268n.
ora premere: 255–6n.
ora resolvere: 255–6n.
orbis: 54n., 494n., 717n.
ore edere: 434n.
Oriens: 653n.
origo: 65n.
os: 269n., 557n.
os sonare: 572n.
oscines: 448n.
otium: 67–8n.

pacalis: 719n.
Pagasaeus: 491n.
pagina: 19–20n.
palma: 185–6n.
palum: 665n.
Pan/ Panes: 397n., 412n.
paratus: 437n.
Parrhasius: 478n.
partu(s) dare/ edere: 623n.
patrius: 458n.
Patulcius: 129–30n.
pauca (verba): 148n.
pauper: 198n.

pavidus metus: 16n.
penes: 531n.
per . . . eo: 15n.
perennare: 721n.
pererrare: 234n.
Pergama: 525n.
perspicere: 139n.
pinea texta: 506n.
pinus: 519n.
pius: 527n.
placida quies: 205n.
placidus voltus: 3n.
pluris: 197n.
poenas dare/ luere: 353n.
pompa: 716n.
pondus habere: 181–2n.
populari: 684n.
populus: 279n.
porro: 635n.
possidere: 212n.
praecedere: 705n.
praemium: 12n.
praescius: 538n.
praesta: 288n.
praestruere: 563n.
praetor: 207n.
prex: 176n.
prima Ceres: 349n.
primus et ultimus: 717n.
princeps: 19–20n.
priscus: 197n.
procella: 488n.
prodire: 33n.
proelia movere: 569n.
proflare: 573n.
proles: 449n.
pronus (in): 397n.
propexus: 259n.
proposito favere: 468n.
provincia: 589n.
pugnam committere: 267n.
purpura: 81n.

Q.R.C.F.: 49–52n.
qua: 281n.
-que (explicative): 446n.
-que (narratival connective attached to a word in direct speech): 509n.
querna glans: 676n.
quietem/ somnum capere: 205n.
Quirinus: 37n.
quisquis es: 89n.

recognoscere: 7n.
redimire: 711n.
redire (in formam): 112n., 374n.
reformidare: 666n.
regere: 251n.
rem gerere: 570n.
repentinus: 270n.
revocamen: 561n.
rex (sacrorum): 49–52n., 319n., 333n.
rigidus: 391n.
risus: 438n.
rorare (intrans.): 375n.
ruber: 400n.
rudere: 433n.
rugosus: 185n.

sacra: 7n.
sacrificus: 130n.
saepe: 10n.
saepta/ Saepta: 53n.
saetiger: 352n.
saltum dare: 507n.
salve/ salvete: 509n.
Saturnia (Juno): 265n.
Saturnius: 237–8n.
scabra robigo: 687n.
scilicet: 29n.
scindere: 62n.
scorteum: 629n.
secedere: 643n.
secura otia: 67–8n.
sedere: 576n.
semimas: 588n.
series rerum: 62n.
signare: 230n.
silvae: 512n.
sitire: 216n.
socius: 608n.
solvere: 108n., 642n.
somno excuti: 547n.
sopore vinci: 422n.
spica Cilissa: 76n.
stipes: 570n.
stips: 189n.
stipula: 205n.
stirps: 363n.
strues: 276n.
sub (= *in*): 186n.
sub averso Marte: 60n.
subponere: 306n.
sucus: 351n.
suffundere: 215n.
superator: 641n.
superesse: 233n.
surgere: 425n.
suspirare (in): 417n.

tacere (+acc.+ inf.): 583n.
tangere: 427n.

Tarpeius: 79n.
Tegeaeus: 545n.
temerarius: 623n.
tempora: pp. 2, 11, 12; 1n., 143–4n.
tempora perdere: 143n.
tenere: 498n.
ter quarter: 576n.
Thybris: 241–2n.
timor: 551n.
Tirynthius: 547n.
Titan: 617n.
trabea: 37n.
transformis: 373n.
transire: 651n.
tremulus: 78n.
trepidus reus: 22n.
trinodis: 575n.
triplex: 387n.
triticeus: 693n.
Trivia: 389n.
tumere: 215n.
turba: 42n., 639n.
ultor: 562n.
ulva: 200n.
urere: 413n., 680n.
ut . . . ita/ sic: 333n.
uti: 225n.
utilis: 677n.
utilitas: 273n.
vaga signa: 310n.
vates: 101n.
vector: 433n.
velle: 185n.
vena: 271n.
venerandus: 646n.
Venus: 397n.
vera causa: 332n.
verbena: 381n.
verberare: 77n.
versus: 141n. *vertens*: 141n.
vertere: 369n., 699n.
vester (= *tuus*): 285n.
victima: 335–6n., 335n.
victor: 562n.
victrix: 525n.
vidi: 389n.
vilicus: 667n.
vincula: 410n.
viola: 346n.
viscera: 51n., 588n., 624n.
vitium caeli: 688n.
voces: 102n.
volgus: 644n.
voltus: 18n.
votum: 431–2n.
vox: 561n.

ἀγών: 328n.
ἀγῶνες: 329–30n.
ἀγωνία: 328n.

2. GENERAL

abortion
- Augustan attitude to: 621–8 (ii) n.
- methods of: 623–4n.
- military imagery for: 623n.
- Ovidian criticism of: 621–8 (ii) n., 623n., 624n.

accusative of respect: 407n., 711n.
Aeneas: 469–542 (ii) n., 527–8n., 527n.
Aesculapius
- miraculous birth of: 291–2n.
- temple of: 291–2n.

Ages, Myth of
- birds safe in Golden Age: 441n.
- contentment with natural products during Golden Age: 193–4n.
- farming as part of degenerate age: 666n., 677n.
- gods mingle with humans: 247–8n.
- Justice last to leave earth: 249–50n.
- no concern for riches in Golden Age: 345–6n.
- no judicial system in Golden Age: 251n.
- no ships in Golden Age: 339n.

Agonalia
- etymologies for *Agonalis*: 319–32n.
- Janus appeased on: 318n.
- nature of festival: 317–18n.

alliteration: 75–6n., 211–12n., 393n.
anaphora: 10n., 67–70n., 67–8n., 92n., 149–60n., 217–18n., 489n., 639–40n., 667–8n., 703n.
Aqua Virgo, aqueduct: 464n.
Aquarius: 651–2nn.
Ara Maxima: *see* Hercules and Cacus
Ara Pacis Augustae: *see* Peace/ peace
Aratus, poem ascribed to Germanicus: 311–14 (iv) n.
Arcadians: 469–70n.
Aristaeus: 363–4n., 363n.
ass: *see also* sacrifice, animal
- metaphor for human lust: 433–4n.
- source of fear: 433–4n.
- thwarts lust: 433–4n.

assonance: 621–8 (ii) n.
astrology: *see* astronomy
astronomy
- absence of astrology from poem: 295–310 (i) n., 310n., 651n.
- astrologers: 295–310 (i) n.
- astronomers outside poles of Roman behaviour: 301–2n.
- eulogy to astronomers: 295–310n.
- future tense typically used for stellar observation: 311n.
- military imagery for: 309–10n.
- motivation for inclusion of stars in the poem: 311–14 (iii) n.
- observance of rising and setting of stars: 311–14 (ii) n.
- planets: 310n.
- slippery time references for stars: 311–12n., 315n., 317n., 653n., 655n.
- star myths: 311–14 (ii) n.
- star rising as emerging from the sea: 458n.
- star rising signalled by weather: 315–16n.
- star setting as falling beneath the earth: 2n.
- star setting as plunging into the sea: 314n.
- stars and the calendars: 311–14 (i) n.
- tension between stellar and earthly worlds: 295–310 (ii) n., 311–14 (iii) n., 457–8n., 650n.
- writers of astronomical poetry: 295–310 (i) n.

asyndeton: 106n., 117n.
attraction, noun (into relative clause): 368n.
Augustus/ Octavian
- as earthly counterpart to Jupiter: 608n.
- as Jupiter himself: 650n.
- associated with Ceres: 657–704 (iii) n.
- 'Augustus' as new name for Octavian: 590n.
- conception-sign of Capricorn: 651n.
- declines honours: 533n.
- distinction between foreign and civil war: 637–50 (i) n.
- distinction between public and private expense: 203n.

etymologies of *augustus*: 611–12n., 611n., 612n.
eulogy to the bearer of the title 'Augustus': 593–616n.
intolerance of free speech reflected in the poem: 25n., 445n.
marital intrigues of: 650n.
panegyric technique in eulogy to: 593–616 (ii) n.
policy of non-expansion of empire: 613n., 713–14n.
reasons for choice of name 'Augustus': 609–10n.
'restoration of Republic': 589n.
sleeps in 'humble' bed: 205n.
wedding anniversary with Livia: 650n.

Bacchus: 393–4n., 393n.
birds, augural:
as messengers of gods: 445–8n.
cock: 455–6n.
dove: 451–2n.
dove, proverbial fidelity of: 451n.
goose: 453–4n.
types of: 448n.
bougonia (process of bees generated from bull carcass): 363–80n.

Cacus: *see* Hercules and Cacus
Cadmus: 489–90n., 490n.
calendar, composition of
dies atri (black days): 57–60n.
dies comitiales (assembly days): 53n.
dies fasti (lawful days): 48n.
dies nefasti (unlawful days): 47n.
feriae conceptivae (moveable festivals): 659–60n.
Ides: 56n., 587n.
Kalends: 55n.
Nones: 57n.
nundinae (market days): 54n.
nundinal letters: 54n.
Q.R.C.F.: 49–52n.
reformation by Julius Caesar and Augustus: 9n., 27–44n., 43–4n.
calendars, official: p. 7; 11n., 657n.
and seasonal comment: 459–60n.
and stars: *see* astronomy
limitations as source for the poem: 289n.
Ovidian claims to consult: 289n., 657n.
Callimachus, influence of: 1–2 (i) n.
Capitol: 203n.
Capricorn: *see* Augustus/ Octavian
Carmentis
as (un)reliable authority: 468n., 474n., 477n., 496n., 499–500n.
associated with Porrima and Postverta: 633–6n.
etymologies of name of: 467n.
festival of: 462n., 627–8n.
leather barred from shrine of: 629n.
prophecy: *see* prophecy of Rome, Carmentis'
shrine of: 629n.
source of strength to Evander: 469–542 (i) n., 479–96n.
carriages
Roman women's privilege to ride in: 619n.
etymology of *carpentum*: 620n.
Castor and Pollux, temple of: 706n.
Ceres
associated with Augustus: *see* Augustus/ Octavian
associated with Livia: *see* Livia
associated with Peace: *see* Peace/peace
associated with Tellus/ Terra: 671–2n.
Ceres Mater et Ops Augusta, altar to: 657–704 (iii) n.
chiasmus: 361n.
coin (*as/ aes signatum*): 229–54n.
colour terms, juxtaposition of: 186n.
Concord/ concord, Roman
dedication by Camillus: 637–50 (i) n., 643–4n., 644n.
dedication by Tiberius: 637–50 (i) n., 637n., 647n.
'duality' of service to: 640n., 648n., 649n.
dynamics of: 637–50 (i) n.
conditional clauses:
imperative equivalent to protasis of: 17n.
indicative replaces subjunctive in apodosis of: 599n.
irregular tense of verb in: 17n.
consolation, literature of: 479–96n.
cease lamentation: 479–80n.
excessive lamentation as womanly: 479–80n.
misfortune could not have been prevented: 479–80n.
no personal wrongdoing led to exile: 484n.
others have experienced the same plight: 487–92n.
wise man can makes his home anywhere: 493–4n.

constellations: *see* astronomy or individual names of constellations
consular procession, Roman: 75–88n., 81–2n.
bundles of rods and axes (*fasces*): 81n.
consular toga: 81n.
curule chair: 82n.
perceived favour of the gods towards: 85–6n.
poet's rejoicing at: 87–8n.
sensual depiction of: 75–88n.
subject of imperial eulogy: 75–88n.
two animals sacrificed at: 83n.
cosmetics, women's: 303n.
cosmogony
as generic marker: 105–10n.
competing systems of thought of: 105–10n.
costum: 341n.
Crab, constellation
poetic/ generic significance of: 311–14 (v) n.
setting of: 311–14 (v) n.
currency, Roman (development of): 221n.

darnel: 691n.
deity pluralisation: 397n.
dew, evening: 312n.
'didactic mode': *see Fasti* and 'didactic mode'
Dolphin, constellation
causes tension between stellar and earthly worlds: 457–8n.
rising of: 457–8n.
domus Augusta: 532n.
dropsy (as sign of over-indulgence): 215–16n.

ellipse: 171n.
epanalepsis: 551n.
epibaterion (speech of the arriver): 509–14n.
praise of divine/ geographical features of new land: 511–12n.
epithet, transferred: 130n., 474n., 538n.
Etna: 573–4n.
etymological play: 180n., 340n., 353–60n., 386n., 402n., 438n., 552n., 553–4n., 629n., 644n., 681n.
etymologies, miscellaneous: 237–8n., 335–6n.
etymologising techniques, use of: 325–6n., 620n.
euphemism, sexual: 425–32n., 425n., 427n., 431n., 431–2n., 437n.
Evander:
as surrogate for the exiled poet: 469–542 (ii) n., 479–96n., 481–2n., 483n., 487–92n.
as weak: 469–542 (i) n.
founder of Pallanteum: 469–542 (i) n.
parentage of: 471–2n.
exegesis, multiple: 101–44n., 319–32n.
condition/ practice explained in terms of its suitability for a present function: 101–44n.
creative quality to/ manipulation of: 319–32n., 620n.
indicative of Roman religion: 319–32n.
no supporting evidence given for variant interpretations: 322n.
poet lends support to particular interpretation: 332n.
exile, Ovid's (reminiscences of): 32n., 389–90n., 469–542 (ii) n., 479–96n., 481–2n., 483n., 487–92n., 540n.

Fabii: 605–6n.
Falerii: 84n.
famine, Roman (A.D. 5–8): 657–704 (iii) n.
farming
breeding animals in June/ July: 156n.
calving in spring: 156n.
Fasti
and 'didactic mode': pp. 3–4, 12–13; 27–62n., 45n., 49–52n., 49n., 58n., 189–90n., 318n., 319–32n., 389n., 635n.
and elegy: p. 4; 5n., 13–14n., 261nn., 301n.
and epic: 1–2 (iii) n., 469–542 (i) n., 552n.
as *carmen deductum*: 709n.
Books 7–12: p. 16 n. 3
(importance of) calendar framework to: p. 3 n. 5, 8–9
(blurring of) chronological references in: p. 10; 311–12n., 315n., 317n., 461n., 617n., 655n.
comments of seasonal interest in: 459–60n.
composed at same time as *Metamorphoses*: p. 16 n. 5; 1–2 (iv) n.
continuous readings of: p.10; 621–8 (ii) n.
material amassed by research and divine inspiration: 101n.

omissions in: p. 8
opposition between *arma* and *arae* in: 13–14n., 22n., 261n., 715n.
opposition between *arma* and *sidera* in: 29n.
postponement of celebration of July and August in: 42n.
published after Ovid's death: p. 22
recent scholarship on: p. ix, 1, 12 n. 21
simultaneity with year: *see* simultaneity between poem and year
sources for: p. 13 n. 24; 7n.
symbiotic link with Janus: *see* Janus
thematic and generic tensions articulated by Romulus and Numa in: 27–44n.

Fasti Book 1
competing ideas in: 75–88n., 83n., 89–288 (ii) n.
deceptive nature of introductory section (1–62) to: pp. 1–2; 62n.
first reading of introductory section (1–62) to: pp. 2–4
negative mirroring of Book 6 in: 293–4n., 391–440 (ii) n.
overview of content of: pp. 5–6
overview of important events between A.D. 2–17 relating to: p. 25
post-Augustan outlook of: p.24; 67n., 590n., 593–616 (i) n., 701n.
'temporal oscillation' in the prologue to: 3–4n., 17n., 19–20n.
thematic stress on peace in: *see* Peace/ peace
variety of styles in: p. 9; 349–52n.
verbal links between stories in: 479n., 560n.

Feriae Sementivae: *see* Sowing, Festival of
Fortuna Virilis, allusion to temple of: 479n.
friendship (*amicitia*): 218n.

gemination: 508n.
Germanicus
(shared) achievements of: 11–12n., 15n., 285n., 701n.
address to: 590n.
appeals from exile to: p. 17; 3–26n.
as augur: 26n.
as god: 5–6n., 15–16n., 17n., 20n.
as source of literary inspiration: 5–6n., 17n., 20n.
client/ patron relationship with the poet: 5–6n.
early career of: 3–26n.
(subtle) encouragement for: 293–4n.
literary skills/ output of: 19–20n., 25n.
oratorical skills of: 21–2n.
poet of the *Aratus* (?): 311–14 (iv) n.
reputation for kindness of: 21–2n.
sympathy for death of father, Nero Claudius Drusus: 597n., 598n.
triumph awarded to: 63–4n., 285–6n.
triumph celebrated by: 285–6n.
visit to oracle at Claros: 20n.

gestation period, duration of: 33–4n.
Gigantomachy: *see also* metaphors and imagery, Gigantomachic
as generic marker: 307–8n.
ordering of piled mountains in: 307–8n.
glory, Roman: 303n., 713n., 714n.
goose liver, Roman delicacy of: 453–4n.

Hercules and Cacus, episode of: 543–82n.
Ara Maxima: 581n.
Cacus as coward: 571–2nn.
Cacus as Giant: 555n., 557–8n., 563n., 564n., 567–8n., 573–4n.
Cacus as semi-human: 553n.
Cacus as uncivilised: 551–8n., 555–6n.
Cacus associated with both Aventine and Palatine: 551n.
Cacus initiates battle: 569–70n.
Hercules as articulate: 561n.
Hercules as perceptive: 548n.
Hercules as pious: 561n.
Hercules, cult names for: 562n., 580n.
Hercules, deification of: 583–4n.
Hercules entertained by Evander: 545n.
Hercules, order of labours: 565n.
hyperbole in: 554n.
impact of Vergil on: 543–82 (ii) n.
Relieving of Atlas' globe by Hercules: 565n.
sources for: 543–82 (i) n.
varied references to Hercules in: 543n.

iconography, representations of:
Aeneas fleeing Troy: 527–8n.
demi-god lifting up nymph's garment: 425–32n.
moment of live sacrifice: 321n.
Priapus and phallus: 400n.

imperial family
handling of imperial achievement: pp. 11–12; 9n., 15n.
imprecision of references to: 31n., 530n., 533n., 593–616 (i) n., 599–600n., 608n., 613n., 614n.
incense: 341n.
interview technique, Ovidian: 89–288 (iii) n., 660n.
answering immediately with a subordinate clause: 231n.
answers use the wording of the question: 114n., 239n.
detailing of interviewee's mannerisms: 177n.
double enquiry: 89–92n.
interviewer, Ovid as
asks questions eagerly: 89–92n., 171n., 183–4n., 189–90n.
fascination for knowledge: 165n., 229n.
growing confidence in Janus' presence: 147–8n., 227–8n., 255–6n.
invites reflection on former career as lover: 138n., 277n.
tactless and naïve at start: 149–60n., 168n., 191–2n.
Isis
identified with Io: 454n.
Roman condemnation of: 453–4n.

Janus
ambivalent attitude towards the present: 131–2n., 219–20n., 221n., 223–6n., 225n.
ancient interpretations of: 89–288 (ii) n.
appeased on Agonalia: 318n.
arch close to financial sector of Rome: 195–6n.
as boaster: 103n., 117–20nn., 126n., 133–4n., 224n., 268n., 269n.
as didactic teacher: 101n., 115n., 133n., 227n., 229n., 233n.
as doorkeeper: 125n., 173–4n.
as Geminus: 135n.
as guardian of arches: 257–8n.
as Hecate: 141–2n.
as jovial: 103n., 113–14n., 129n., 131–2n., 143–4n., 191–2n.
as opener of everything: 117–20n.
as pacifist: 223–6n., 226n., 253–4nn., 259–76n., 273n.
as Patulcius/ Clusius: 129–30n.
as personification of elegiac poem: 162n.
as poet: 268n., 269–70n.
as Sun/ Apollo: 125n., 140n.
as world/ universe: 105–10n., 112n., 140n.
associated with water: 269n.
awareness of tendency to digress: 219–20n.
bearded: 259n.
double shape of: 65–6n., 66n., 89n., 92n., 95n., 96n., 100n., 101–44n., 102n., 255–6n.
etymology for Ianiculum: 245–6n.
etymologies for name of: 103n., 127n.
explanations for shape of: 113–14n., 143–4n.
explanations for symbolism of temple of: 121–4nn., 279–82n., 701–2n.
head depicted on coin (*aes signatum*): 229–54n.
Hours as attendants of: 125n.
inhabits Ianiculum: 241–6n.
invoked first in prayer: 171–2n.
keen to exaggerate: 118n., 125n., 193–226n., 193–4n.
keen to reminisce like an old man: 193–226n., 229–54n.
mixing metaphors: 181–2n.
offered sacrificial cake (*strues*): 276n.
Porta Ianualis: 265n.
problems surrounding number of closures of temple of: 282n.
rescues Rome from Sabine attack: 259–76n.
significance in Augustan age of: 89–288 (ii) n.
similar to Vertumnus (Prop. 4.2): 89–288 (ii) n., 89–288 (iv) n., 162n.
staff and key of: 99n.
symbiotic link with *Fasti*: 89–288 (iv) n., 103–4n., 253–4n., 267–70n., 273n.
temple of Janus Geminus/ Quirinus: 257–8n.
temple restored in A.D. 17: 223–4n.
theophany of: 93–100n.
uses language of doors: 120n., 272n.
visits Ovid's house adjacent to Capitol: 243–4n., 263n.
Jason: 491n.
Juno Moneta, temple of: 638n.
Jupiter Optimus Maximus, temple of: 201–2n.
Augustan restoration of: 203n.
Juturna, temple of: 463n.

Lar (*familiaris*): 136n.
laurel
  proverbially loud when burning: 344n.
  ritual uses of: 344n.
  symbol of victory at Actium: 711–12n.
legal terminology: 107n., 359n.
Lex Oppia
  loss of female privileges under: 621–8 (i) n., 621n.
  repeal of: 621–8 (i) n.
Liber, Libera and Ceres, temple of: 657–704 (iii) n.
Lion, constellation: 655–6n.
Livia
  appeals from exile to: p. 17; 515–36 (iii) n., 637–50 (ii) n.
  as Carmentis: 515–36 (ii) n.
  as Juno: 650n.
  as 'only wife' of Augustus: 650n.
  as Venus: 649n.
  associated with Ceres: 657–704 (iii) n.
  involved in dedication of Tiberian temple to Concord: 649n.
  ironic take on chastity of: 650n.
  joint dedication of Porticus Liviae with Tiberius: 649n.
  marital intrigues of: 650n.
  predicted deification of: 535–6n.
  sets up altar at the Porticus Liviae: 649n.
  title of Iulia Augusta: 515–36 (iii) n.
  wedding anniversary with Augustus: 650n.
locus amoenus: 423–4n.
Lyre, constellation: 315–16n., 653–4n.
  rising accompanied by bad weather: 315–16n.

(*magnus*) /*maior*/ *maximus*, crescendo of: 541–2n., 603–6n.
Master of Ceremony, Ovidian persona: 65–74n., 657–704 (ii) n., 663–70n., 675–94n., 719–22n.
  speaks to animals: 663n., 685–6n.
  switches identity: 681n., 695n.
Messalla, family name of: 595n.
metaphors and imagery:
  abortion as military campaign: 623n.
  animal bonds as human marriage: 334n.
  animal eating crops as military campaign: 683n., 684n., 685–6n.
  captured cities/ countries as forlorn women: 286n., 645–6n.
  day dawning as Aurora leaving Tithonus: 461n.
  empire as physical burden: 534n., 616n.
  farming as banking: 694n.
  Gigantomachic: 210n., 298n., 307–8n., 555n., 557–8n., 563n., 564n., 567–8n., 573–4n.
  Hippocrene font as source of poetic inspiration: 24n.
  human fortune as weather: 495–6n.
  leader as Atlas: 616n.
  poetry as chariot race: 25n.
  poetry as ship voyage: 4n., 466n.
  stars as entities plunging into sea: *see* astronomy
  statesman as charioteer: 532n.
metre, elegiac
  does not compromise narrative build-up: 551–8n.
  ending couplet with metrically-convenient forms of *esse*/ *habere*: 196n.
  sentence continues beyond couplet: 127–30n.
  spondaic pentameter: 195–6n.
midwinter: 459–60n.
months, naming of
  April: 39n.
  February: 43–4n.
  March: 39n.
  May/ June: 41n.
  January: 43–4n.
  Quin(c)tilis-December: 42n.
monuments, Ovidian manipulation of: 293–4n., 707n.
motifs, miscellaneous
  acorns as pre-agricultural diet: 675–6n.
  aesthetic charm of bird song: 441n., 444n.
  ants as diligent in acquiring food: 685–6n.
  aquatic deities can change shape: 369–70n.
  aquatic deities drip moisture from hair/ beard: 375n.
  Bacchic worshippers as unkempt: 405–6n.
  circularity of avarice: 211–12n., 213–14n.
  dying body falling and vomiting blood: 577–8n.
  dying warrior consoled by status of his conqueror: 522n.
  exiles become city founders: 477n.

farming tools converted into weapons: 699–700n.
flame of love: 411n.
flower-picking as pursuit of the innocent: 345–6n.
ground whitened by ubiquity of bones: 557–8n.
hair standing on end: 97n.
high flame as good omen: 78n.
humble couch: 200n.
ingenium and *ars* required for poetry: 23–4n.
inspired prophet as mad/ burning/ fierce: 473n., 503–6n.
inspired prophet with dishevelled hair: 503–6n.
intellectual pursuit as journey to heavens: 298n., 299–300n.
literary patron gives heart to poet: 17n.
love-making among the aged as disgraceful: 414n.
lovers communicate through nods and signs: 418n.
making use of natural products as sign of morality: 200n., 202n., 345–6n.
man only worth his financial assets: 217–18n.
money needed for political advancement: 217–18n.
morning as foil for subsequent drama: 547n.
night time as foil for subsequent drama: 421n.
nocturnal approach on lover: 425–32n.
nod as sign of divine approval: 70n.
note of uncertainty/ scepticism appropriate for relating the fabulous: 94n., 469n.
old man stereotype: 193–226n.
parental love of birds: 443n.
physical weightiness as mark of important being: 82n.
prophets must be constrained: 369–70n.
right foot as lucky: 514n.
ripe vine-shoot as image of spring: 152n.
ship 'cutting' through water: 498n.
sleep and wine as foil for subsequent outrage: 421n.
sleepless nights for the wealthy: 205n.
stealthy assailant holds breath: 428n.
stealthy assailant on tip-toe: 426n.
stern as place for important utterance: 503n.
storms as a cause of fear: 495n.
swallow as herald of spring: 157–8n.
touching the stars: 210n.
universal repercussions: 567–8n.
unlawful to look upon deity: 148n.
wish to be born in earlier age: 223–6n.
women cause wars: 520n.
words have weight/ not blown away by wind: 181–2n.
words not falling but rising to gods: 181–2n.
'yoked animals could not have moved it': 564n.
mourning period, widow (duration of): 35–6n.
myrrh: 339n.

New Year/1st January
begins during winter (solstice), not spring: 149–60n., 163n., 164n.
gift of coin on: 189n.
gifts of dates, figs and honey on: 185–6n.
minimal ('mock') work carried out on: 167–70n., 169–70n.
pleasantries uttered on: 63–4n.
Night, chthonic deity: 455–6n.
Numa
addition of two months to the Romulan year: 27–44n.
as peaceful and pious: 27–44n., 43–4n.
diametrically opposed to Romulus: 27–44n.
numeral duplication: 28n., 564n.

oats, wild: 692n.
Octavian: *see* Augustus/Octavian
odd numbers as propitious: 506n.
omen in beginnings: 178n., 179n. 180n.
Ovid
antiquarian persona of: 631n.; *see also* interviewer, Ovid as
avoids giving voice to inanimate objects: 355–8n.
death of: p. 18 n. 14
dislikes legal profession: 73–4n.
exile of: pp. 15–17
friends with the family of Messalla: 595n.
interest in concept of metamorphosis: 373n.

lives adjacent to Capitol: 243–4n., 263n.
maturation of poet from love elegy: 301n.
poetic production during A.D. 8–14: p.19
oxymoron: 411n.

Pallanteum: *see* Evander
Pan/ Panes: 395–400n., 397n.
parentheses: 565n., 659n.
Peace/ peace, Roman
achieved through military exploit: 67n., 709–22 (ii) n.
achieved through promoting fear in others: 717–18n.
Ara Pacis Augustae/ Altar of Augustan Peace: 709–22 (i) n., 719–20n.
associated with Ceres: 704n.
eulogies to: 709–22 (ii) n.
tension between idealised and Augustan peace: 709–22 (ii) n., 715n., 716n., 717–18n.
thematic stress on: p. 24; 3n., 67–8n., 146n., 657–704 (iii) n., 709–22 (ii) n., 719n., 721–2n.
philosophy, popular
conscience spurs on hope or fear: 485–6n.
disease-ridden sky caused by harmful seeds: 688n.
earth as stationary sphere in middle of universe: 110n.
wise man makes his home anywhere: 493–4n.
pleonasm: 549n.
pluperfect tense: 259–76n., 550n., 563n.
polyptoton: 25n., 481–2n., 523n., 669n., 707n.
polysyndeton: 149–60n.
Porta Ianualis: *see* Janus
Porticus Liviae: *see* Livia
praeteritio: 492n.
prayer, Roman
appeal for favour: 15–16n., 67n.
appeal for mildness: 17n., 712n.
appeal to shake out fear from heart: 15–16n.
avoid overgrowth in crops: 689–90n.
emphasis on parts of *tu/ tuus* in address ('Du Stil'): 65–70n., 65–6n.
remove pests from crop: 683–92n.
safeguard growing crop: 675–94n.
safeguard peace and its guardians: 287–8n., 721–2n.
secure successful harvest for farmer: 677–8n.
priamel: 301–4n.
Priapus
character in drama: 391–440 (i) n.
cultic activity of: 391n., 440n.
guardian of countryside/ gardens: 391n., 415n.
phallus of: 391n., 400n., 435–8n., 437n.
statue painted red: 400n.
syncretised with Bacchus and Pan: 395–400n.
Priapus and Lotis, episode of: 391–440n.
and the Priapic corpus: 391–440 (i) n.
Augustan reaction to: 391–440 (iii) n.
colour contrast between assailant and victim: 427n.
influence from the stage: 414n., 421n., 423–4n., 425–32n., 433–4n., 436n., 437–8n., 437n.
interaction with Priapus and Vesta episode (6.319–48): 391–440 (ii) n., 394n., 395–400n., 405–10n., 417–20n., 435–8n.
love-elegiac/ erotic features: 405–6n., 406n., 407n., 409n., 410n., 417–20n., 418n., 419n., 425n.
sexual euphemism in: *see* euphemism, sexual
sources for: 391–440 (i) n.
stories of Priapus chasing a lover: 391–440n.
pronoun, disregard for changes in: 417n.
prophecy of Rome, Carmentis': 515–36n.
chronological sequence broken for panegyric effect: 527–8n.
language of: 529n.
personal feeling from the speaker: 521–2n.
political dimension to: 515–36 (i) n.
sources for: 515–36 (i) n.
public office, striving for (*ambitio*): 303n.
Pythagoras, reminiscences of Ovid's: 151n., 327n., 337–48n., 337–8n., 349–456 (i) n., 349–52n., 350n., 351n., 353–60n., 353n., 361n., 362n., 380n., 383–4n., 441n.

recusatio: 13–14n.
red lettering of official documents: 11n.
religious experience, Roman: pp. 7–8; 319–32n.
religious procedure, Roman
  animals with garlands: 663n.
  appeal for words of good omen or silence: 71n., 72n.
  attendant and *rex* conduct sacrifice: 319n.
  cakes offered to gods: 127–8n., 670n.
  entrails and flesh of sacrificial animal: 51n., 588n., 672n.
  floral garlands: 345n.
  gelded victims: 588n.
  Flamen Dialis: 56n., 587n.
  obscenity/ nudity in: 391–440 (iii) n.
  pontiffs in charge of religious duties: 462n.
  purification of land: 669n.
  regina sacrifices to Juno on the Kalends: 55n.
  rex (*sacrorum*) presides over sacrifice: 333n.
  sacrificial animal exempt from work on land: 83–4n.
  salt and emmer wheat offered to gods: 127–8n.
  salt and emmer wheat sprinkled over sacrificial victim: 337–8n.
  senate and magistrates dedicate temples: 290n.
  wearing white: 79n.
  white victims to heavenly gods: 720n.
  wine and incense offered to gods: 172n.
  wine poured over head of sacrificial victim: 720n.
  work forbidden on holy days: 73–4n.
repetition, emphatic word: 27n., 114n., 239n., 295n., 360n.
revision of the text: pp. 15–25
  approach adopted in Commentary: pp. 23–4
  case for revision: pp. 15–17
  dynamic approaches to the issue: pp. 18–23
  extent of revision outside Book 1: p. 18 n. 12
Rome
  as the world (*Urbs/ orbis*): 85–6n., 517n.
  careers in love and leisure scorned: 301–2n.
  careers in politics and military praised: 301–2n.
  comparisons between early and contemporary sites: 193–226n., 515n.
  curtailment of wealth in middle Republic: 207–8n.
  degeneration in morality in 2nd century B.C.: 209–12n.
  'divorce' between early and contemporary sites: 193–226n.
  early leaders take office from the plough: 207–8n.
  early Romans as hardy and rural: 204n., 207–8n., 243–4n.
  gives laws to the whole world: 516n.
  mimetic/ deictic approach to: 243–4n., 258n., 263n., 464n., 582n.
  personified with raised head: 209n.
  risen from vanquished Troy: 523–4n., 526n.
  subject of diatribes on moral degeneracy: 193–226n.
  terracotta statues of gods in early temples: 201–2n., 202n.
  viewed as synthesis of splendour with old-fashioned values: 193–226n.
  visual brilliance of: 70n., 77n., 637n.
  walls constructed by Neptune: 525n.
Romulus
  as Quirinus: 37n.
  casa Romuli (hut of Romulus) as moral paradigm: 199n.
  diametrically opposed to Numa: 27–44n.
  formation of ten-month year: 27–44n.
  man with some rationale: 33–4n., 35–6n., 39–42n.
  predilection for warfare: 27–44n., 29n.
  wearing *trabea*: 37n.

sacred rites: 7n.
sacrifice, animal: *see also* religious procedure, Roman
  anti-sacifice tradition: 349–456 (i) n.
  ass: 391–440n.; *see also* ass
  birds: 441–56n.; *see also* birds, augural
  bull: 363–80n.
  dog: 389–90n.
  goat: 353–60n.
  gods implicated in: 349–52n.
  hind/ deer: 387–8n.
  history of: 349–456n.
  horse: 385n.
  sheep: 381–2n.
  sow/ pig: 349–52n.

subtle criticism of: 327n., 328n., 334n., 337–8n., 349–456n., 349n., 363–80n., 383–4n., 386n., 387–8n., 391–440 (iii) n., 441–56n., 445n., 451n., 453–4n.; *see also* Pythagoras, reminiscences of Ovid's
saffron: 76n., 342n.
savine (*herba Sabina*): 343n.
Saturn
arrival into Italy of: 229–54n., 233–40n.
bearing sickle: 234n.
dethroned by Jupiter: 236n.
Italy as 'Saturnian': 237–8n.
Satyrs: 395–400n., 397n.
Silenus: 395–400n., 399n.
simultaneity between poem and year: 2n., 4n., 71n., 150n., 495–6n., 709n., 723–4n.
Sowing, Festival of/ Feriae Sementivae, episode of: *see also* Master of Ceremony, Ovidian persona
blending in of detail from other festivals in: 669n.
competing views of farming in: 666n., 677n.
connection to Paganalia: 669n.
evocation of different times in the farming season in: 665–6n., 681n.
nature of festival: 657–704 (i) n., 658n.
political resonance to: 657–704 (iii) n.
worship of Ceres and Tellus/ Terra in: 671–2n.
spring
arrival of: 664n.
praise of: 149–60n.
stars: *see* astronomy
syllepsis: 597n.

Tarentum/ Terentum: 501–2n.
Tarpeia: 259–76n., 261n.
theophany: 93–100n.
bright light accompanying deity in: 94n.
fear/ awe of the mortal in: 97–8n.
suddenness of arrival in: 96n.
theoxeny: 235–40n.
three, propitious nature of number: 506n., 575n.
Tiber
carries silt: 241–2n.
erosive powers of: 241–2n.
peaceful waters of: 241–2n.
referred to as Tuscan: 500n.
Thybris as old/ alternative name for: 241–2n.
Tiberius
as Evander: 515–36 (ii) n.
as present Emperor: 613–16n., 613n., 614n.
as religious figure: 640n., 646n.
declines honours: 533n.
joint dedication of Porticus Liviae with Livia: 649n.
relative absence from the poem of: p. 17 n. 8; 10n.
triumph, Roman
march to and from Rome through an arch: 279–82n.
victorious general wearing red paint: 303n.
Tydeus: 491n.
Typhoeus: 573–4n.

Ve(d)iovis, temple of: 293n.
verbena (sacred herb): 381n.
verbs
contracted: 109n.
quick succession of: 417n.
vilicus (farm steward): 667n.
violets: 346n.
voting practice, Roman: 53n.

waxen images: 591n.
wheat, two-fold baking process of: 693n.
wigs, German: 645–6n.
word order, dramatic/ emphatic: 95n., 165–6n., 184n., 213–14n., 223–4n., 227–8n., 425–6n., 433n., 553–4n., 569–70n., 683–4n.
word play: 638n., 671–2n., 678n., 685n.

zeugma: 287n.

3. SIGNIFICANT PASSAGES REFERRED TO IN OVID

Am.
1.1.1–4: 13–14n.
1.1.1: 13n.
1.1.9: 349–50n.
1.6: 138n.
1.6.27–33: 277n.
1.6.55: 312n.
1.7.20: 16n.
1.14.19–21: 405–6n.
1.14.45: 645–6n.
1.15.1–6: 73–4n.
2.1.11–38: 13–14n.
2.10.29: 301n.
2.13: 621–8 (ii) n.
2.14: 621–8 (ii) n.
2.14.9–10: 621–8 (ii) n.
2.14.15–16: 27n.
2.17.7–9: 419n.
2.18.4: 301n.
3.3.30: 202n.
3.8.55–6: 217–18n.
3.10.11–14: 349n.
3.10.35ff.: 349–50n.
3.13.3–5: 631n.
3.13.14: 84n.

Ars
1.460: 22n.
1.530: 410n.
1.733–4: 49n.
1.771: 723–4n.
2.9–10: 466n.
2.88: 16n.
2.277–8: 217–18n.
2.467–8: 106n.
2.467: 111n.
2.504: 409n.
2.745–6: 723–4n.
3.113ff.: 193–226n., 223–6n.
3.115–16: 203n.
3.117–18: 205n.
3.119–20: 243–4n.
3.135–68: 406n.
3.153: 405–6n.
3.163–4: 645–6n.
3.307–10: 409n.
3.386: 241–2n.
3.443: 58n.
3.509–11: 419n.

Fast.
2.1: 723–4n.
2.3: 4n.
2.7–10: 253–4n.
2.16: 15n.
2.7: 1–2n., 1n., 2n., 7n.
2.17: 3n.
2.19–34: 43–4n.
2.27: 389n.
2.47–8: 45n.
2.73–8: 311–14 (ii) n., 315–16n.
2.73: 314n.
2.75–6: 653–4n.
2.77–8: 314n.
2.79–118: 311–14 (ii) n., 457–8n.
2.131–2: 608n.
2.142: 19–20n.
2.145–6: 650n.
2.149–50: 459–60n.
2.151: 58n.
2.153–92: 311–14 (ii) n.
2.243–66: 311–14 (ii) n., 445–8n.
2.267–450: 469–542 (ii) n.
2.279–80: 193–226n., 469–542 (ii) n.
2.280: 243n.
2.283–380: 319–32n.
2.289–90: 469–70n.
2.303–58: 391–440 (i) n.
2.304: 396n.
2.314: 312n.
2.331: 421n.
2.332–3: 421n.
2.334: 46n.
2.335–48: 425–32n.
2.345–6: 437n.
2.347: 431n.
2.355–6: 437–8n.
2.360: 25n.
2.391ff.: 193–226n.
2.391: 243n.
2.408: 518n.
2.423: 541–2n.

2.457–74: 311–14 (ii) n.
2.517: 697–8n.
2.521: 693n.
2.527–30: 659–60n.
2.623–38: 657–704 (ii) n.
2.639–40: 318n.
2.679–80: 469–542 (ii) n.
2.685: 133n.
2.792: 421n.
2.793–4: 425–32n.
2.793: 425n.
2.851–2: 38n.
2.863–4: 4n.
2.863: 723–4n.
3.11ff.: 423–4n.
3.21: 417n.
3.24: 27n.
3.87–96: 7n., 631n.
3.99ff.: 29n.
3.115: 206n.
3.121–6: 33–4n.
3.123: 28n.
3.137–8: 49n.
3.149–50: 42n.
3.155–66: 29n., 43–4n.
3.167–258: 89–288 (iii) n.
3.177: 101n.
3.179ff.: 193–226n.
3.183–4: 199n.
3.185: 205n.
3.230: 260n.
3.238: 152n.
3.274: 631n.
3.291–3: 369–70n.
3.352: 6n.
3.399–402: 311–14 (ii) n.
3.403–14: 311–14 (ii) n.
3.419–20: 599–600n.
3.423–4: 469–542 (ii) n.
3.426–8: 287–8n.
3.429: 8n.
3.435: 45n.
3.449–58: 311–14 (ii) n.
3.459–516: 311–14 (ii) n.
3.543–674: 319–32n.
3.601–2: 469–542 (ii) n.
3.639: 421n.
3.661–2: 332n.
3.693–6: 437–8n.
3.697–710: 89–288 (iii) n.
3.697ff.: 660n.
3.705–7: 127–30n.
3.707–8: 557–8n.
3.711–12: 311–14 (ii) n.
3.757–60: 437–8n.
3.771–88: 319–32n.
3.780: 204n.
3.781: 207–8n.
3.790: 4n.
3.793–808: 311–14 (ii) n.
3.839–44: 319–32n.
3.844: 7n.
3.851–76: 311–14 (ii) n.
3.877–8: 459–60n.
3.881–2: 318n.
4.1–18: 39n., 89–288 (iii) n.
4.10: 25n.
4.11: 1–2n., 7n., 631n.
4.12: 2n.
4.18: 4n.
4.37–8: 469–542 (ii) n., 527–8n.
4.55–8: 469–542 (ii) n.
4.61–132: 39n.
4.65: 469–542 (ii) n.
4.77–8: 469–542 (ii) n.
4.79–82: 479–96n.
4.81–4: p. 18
4.81: 3n.
4.81–2: 11–12n.
4.82: 598n.
4.85–116: 332n.
4.128: 152n.
4.133–40: 657–704 (ii) n.
4.161: 3n.
4.163–4: 311–14 (ii) n., 314n.
4.165–78: 311–14 (ii) n.
4.181–372: 89–288 (iii) n.
4.215–16: 183–4n.
4.246: 278n.
4.251–2: 469–542 (ii) n.
4.255–6: 209n.
4.355–6: 231n.
4.357–9: 127–30n.
4.367–8: 205n.
4.377–86: 57–60n., 89–288 (iii) n.
4.385–6: 315–16n.
4.387–8: 311–14 (ii) n., 314n.
4.413–16: 383–4n.
4.418: 7n.
4.426: 410n.
4.445: 417n.
4.549: 421n.
4.555: 547n.
4.629–34: 671–2n.
4.677–8: 311–14 (ii) n.
4.679ff.: 631n.
4.689–712: 89–288 (iii) n.
4.696: 443n.

4.713–20: 311–14 (ii) n.
4.713–14: 461n.
4.729–30: 4n.
4.731–46: 657–704 (ii) n.
4.747–76: 675–94n.
4.763: 683–92n.
4.767: 683–92n.
4.783–806: 319–32n.
4.783: 133n.
4.793: 332n.
4.879–80: 469–542 (ii) n., 520n.
4.901–4: 311–14 (ii) n.
4.901–2: 459–60n.
4.903–4: 315–16n.
4.905–42: 89–288 (iii) n., 631n.
4.911–32: 675–94n.
4.936: 389n.
4.953–4: 287–8n., 721–2n.
5.1–110: 41n., 89–288 (iii) n., 319–32n.
5.23: 3n.
5.55–78: 41n.
5.90: 469–70n.
5.91–100: 469–542 (ii) n.
5.93ff.: 193–226n.
5.93–4: 502n.
5.93: 243–4n., 243n.
5.94: 243–4n.
5.108: 46n.
5.111–28: 311–14 (ii) n.
5.111–14: 651n.
5.140: 659–60n.
5.145–8: 42n.
5.151–2: 180n.
5.157–8: 515–36 (iii) n.
5.159–82: 311–14 (ii) n.
5.159–60: 461n.
5.183–378: 89–288 (iii) n.
5.194: 177n.
5.275: 165n.
5.277: 149n.
5.297ff.: 223–6n.
5.311: 492n.
5.359–60: 177n.
5.377–8: 288n.
5.379–414: 311–14 (ii) n.
5.415–16: 311–14 (ii) n., 315–16n.
5.417–18: 311–14 (ii) n.
5.417: 705n.
5.445–92: 89–288 (iii) n.
5.493–544: 311–14 (ii) n.
5.519–20: 200n.
5.599–600: 311–14 (ii) n.
5.601–2: 459–60n.
5.603–20: 311–14 (ii) n.
5.603: 705n.
5.635–62: 89–288 (iii) n.
5.639–40: 243–4n.
5.643–8: 469–542 (ii) n.
5.643: 541–2n.
5.649–50: 543n.
5.661–2: 375n.
5.693–720: 89–288 (iii) n., 311–14 (ii) n.
5.721–2: 317–18n.
5.723: 311–14 (ii) n.
5.727–8: 49–52n.
5.727: 8n.
5.733–4: 311–14 (ii) n.
6.1–100: 41n., 89–288 (iii) n., 319–32n.
6.8: 7n.
6.20: 15–16n.
6.21: 101n.
6.25: 45n.
6.55: 359n.
6.57–64: 631n.
6.59–63: 7n.
6.83–8: 41n.
6.89–96: 391–440 (ii) n.
6.101–30: 391–440 (ii) n.
6.101–2: 118n.
6.119–20: 417n.
6.154: 367n.
6.195–6: 311–14 (ii) n.
6.197–8: 311–14 (ii) n.
6.211: 705n.
6.213–18: 89–288 (iii) n.
6.225–34: 89–288 (iii) n.
6.227–8: 241–2n.
6.235–6: 311–14 (ii) n.
6.237–8: 631n.
6.261ff.: 193–226n.
6.261: 205n.
6.313: 693n.
6.319–48: 391–440 (i) n., 391–440 (ii) n.
6.319–20: 392n.
6.320: 396n.
6.321–2: 395–400n.
6.324: 395–400n., 414n.
6.327ff.: 423–4n.
6.327–32: 405–10n.
6.333: 405–10n.
6.335–6: 417–20n.
6.337ff.: 417–20n.
6.337–8: 425–32n.
6.338: 426n.
6.339: 433n.
6.341: 431–2n.
6.342: 433n., 434n.
6.343: 433–4n., 435–8n.

6.344: 435–8n.
6.345: 440n.
6.395–416: 89–288 (iii) n., 631n.
6.401ff.: 193–226n.
6.434: 469–542 (ii) n.
6.471–2: 311–14 (ii) n., 457–8n.
6.505–6: 469–542 (ii) n.
6.529–50: 391–440 (ii) n.
6.567: 461n.
6.585–6: 25n.
6.637–8: 515–36 (iii) n., 649n.
6.649: 8n.
6.652–710: 89–288 (iii) n.
6.673: 421n.
6.711–12: 311–14 (ii) n.
6.717–20: 311–14 (ii) n.
6.717: 314n.
6.720: 457–8n.
6.727: 311–14 (ii) n., 311–14 (v) n., 391–440 (ii) n.
6.733–62: 293–4n., 391–440 (ii) n.
6.787–8: 311–14 (ii) n.
6.789–90: 459–60n.
6.798–810: 89–288 (iii) n.

Her.
11.41–2: 621–8 (ii) n.
11.43–4: 624n.
11.45–6: 623n.
13.133: 561n.
14.29–31: 127–30n.
16.61–2: 95n.
16.68: 15–16n.

Met.
1.4: 1–2 (iv) n., 709n.
1.5ff.: 105–10n.
1.6–7: 111n.
1.21: 107n.
1.87: 111n.
1.89–91: 251n.
1.129: 251n.
1.149: 218n., 222n.
1.221: 420n.
1.339: 375n.
1.490–1: 417n.
2.531–632: 445–8n.
2.537–9: 451–6n.
2.596–7: 561n.
3.24–5: 511–12n.
3.131–2: 540n.
3.527: 359n.
3.689–90: 15–16n.
4.29: 393n.
4.316: 417n.
4.793–4: 278n.
5.115: 420n.
5.192–3: 538n.
5.341–3: 349n.
6.345: 200n.
7.156–7: 527–8n.
8.612–13: 95n.
8.612: 420n.
8.655: 200n.
8.668: 202n.
8.674: 185–6n.
8.677: 185–6n.
8.711: 359n.
8.772–3: 475n.
8.871–2: 373n.
9.62–3: 571–2n.
9.347–8: 391–440n.
10.298–502: 339n.
11.35ff.: 699–700n.
13.624–5: 527–8n.
14.123: 585n.
14.639: 414n.
14.714: 420n.
14.775–99: 259–76n.
14.781–2: 265n.
14.783–9: 267–70n.
14.785: 275n.
14.791: 271n.
14.799–804: 273n.
14.799: 27–44n.
14.828: 37n.
14.835: 367n.
14.849: 27n.
15: 1–2 (iv) n.
15.1–8: 27–44n.
15.75ff.: 349–456 (i) n.
15.96ff.: 337–48n., 337–8n.
15.99: 441n.
15.111–15: 353n.
15.111–13: 349–52n., 350n.
15.114–15: 353–60n.
15.115: 350n., 361n.
15.116–21: 362n.
15.116–19: 383–4n.
15.122–4: 383–4n.
15.127–9: 349–52n., 349–50n.
15.130–5: 327n.
15.199ff.: 151n.
15.201–2: 351n.
15.204: 151n.
15.226: 197n.
15.252–3: 380n.
15.255–7: 380n.

15.364–6: 377n.
15.448–9: 584n.
15.479–84: 27–44n.
15.692: 3n.
15.794–5: 475n.
15.858–60: 608n.

Pont.
1.1.3–4: 3n.
1.2.1: 603n.
1.2.116: 22n.
1.3.61ff.: 487–92n.
1.3.75–84: 487–92n.
1.8.13: 469n.
2.1.57ff.: p. 17; 285–6n.
2.2.50: 22n.
2.5.41–6: 21–2n.
2.5.57–60: 25n.
2.8.37: 25n.
2.8.39–40: 286n.
2.8.43–4: 515–36 (iii) n.
2.9.29–32: 353n.
2.9.65: 25n.
3.1.113ff.: 515–36 (iii) n.
3.1.117: 650n.
3.1.118: 650n.
3.1.145: 650n.
3.4.107–8: 286n., 645–6n.
4.4.18: 26n.
4.4.23ff.: 75–88n.
4.4.31–2: 84n.
4.8: p. 17; 3–26n., 6n.
4.8.29–36: 5n.
4.8.31–4: p. 17; 285–6n.
4.8.41: 84n.
4.8.43: 5–6n.
4.8.50–1: pp. 17–18
4.8.65–6: p. 17; 285–6n.
4.8.67: 5–6n., 25n.
4.8.69–70: 25n.
4.8.77: 19–20n.
4.8.89: 6n.
4.9.23ff.: 75–88n.
4.9.29–32: 85–6n.

Rem.
26: 123n.
196: 153n.
243: 49n.
465: 49n.
577–8: 466n.

Tr.
1.3.29–30: 243–4n., 263n.
1.4: 4n.
2.161–4: 650n.
2.415–16: 621–8 (ii) n.
2.549–52: pp. 15–17, 22; 3–26n.
2.549–50: 723–4n.
3.1.81: 25n.
3.12.13–14: 152n.
3.12.17–18: 73–4n.
3.12.47–8: 286n.
4.2.1–2: 286n.
4.2.43–6: 286n.
4.2.43–4: 645–6n.
4.3.4: 314n.
4.10.17ff.: 73–4n.
5.5.1–12: 657–704 (ii) n.
5.9.31–2: 15n.

4. SIGNIFICANT PASSAGES REFERRED TO IN OTHER AUTHORS

Anthologia Palatina
9.75: 355–8n.
Antiphanes
fr. 18 Kock: 425–32n.
Apollonius Rhodius
1.496ff.: 105–10n.
Aratus
132: 337–8n.
605–6: 2n.
Augustus
RG 4.9: 203n.

Callimachus:
Pf. i.13 *Schol. Flor.* ad frr. 3–7: 319–32n.
Aet.
fr. 1.21–2 Pf.: 93n.
fr. 7.19–21 Pf.: 89–92n.
frr. 26–7 Pf.: 325–6n.
fr. 31B Pf.: 165n.
fr. 43 Pf.: 89–288 (iii) n.
fr. 43.46–56 Pf.: 149–60n.
fr. 43.56–7 Pf.: 177n.
fr. 43.84–5 Pf.: 165n., 631n.
fr. 75.10–11 Pf.: 327n.
fr. 76 Pf.: 149n.
fr. 114 Pf.: 89–288 (iii) n.
frr. 178–84 Pf.: 89–288 (iii) n.
Ap. 4: 75n.
Hecale fr. 240 Pf.: 200n.
Catullus
64.22–3: 223–6n.
64.98: 417n.
64.129: 407n.
64.259–64: 393n.
64.384–96: 247–8n.
64.398: 249–50n.
Censorinus
20.2: 27–44n.
20.4: 27–44n.
22.9: 27–44n.
Cicero
Cael. 65: 436n.
Clu. 35: 35–6n.
Div. 1.16: 201–2n.
Dom. 119ff.: 610n.
Marc. 4: 24n.
Mur. 16: 7n.
N.D. 2.27.1: 127n.
N.D. 2.110: 309n.
N.D. 2.155: 309n.
Off. 1.59: 5–6n.
Tusc. 1.30: 17n.
Ciris
27: 26n.
Claudian
Carm.
1.226ff.: 85–6n.
1.266: 87–8n.
16.270ff.: 87–8n.
28.611ff.: 87–8n.
Columella
11.2.4: 653–4n.
11.2.5: 653–4n., 655–6n.
11.2.14: 653–4n.
11.2.94: 457–8n.
11.2.97: 311–14 (v) n., 315–16n., 459–60n.
Culex
404: 343n.
Cassius Dio
38.18ff.: 479–96n.
38.26.3: 487–92n.
51.22: 203n.
55.22.3: 657–704 (iii) n.
55.26.1: 657–704 (iii) n.
55.31.3–4: 657–704 (iii) n.

Epic. Drusi
45–6: 300n.
283–98: 707n.
380: 650n.
Euripides
fr. 1047 N.: 493–4n.

Fasti Praenestini
Jan. 2: 48n.
Jan. 3: 53n.
Jan. 9: 317–18n.
Jan. 10: 8n.
Jan. 13: 589n.

Jan. 16: 637–50n.
Jan. 27: 706n.
Jan. 30: 709–22n.
Fasti Verulani
Jan. 17: 650n.
Festus
9 L.: 329–30n., 331n.
45 L.: 103n.

Aulus Gellius
3.16.16: 27–44n.
Germanicus
Arat.: 311–14 (iv) n.
321: 457–8n.
558–60: 651n.

Herodotus
1.216.4: 386n.
Hesiod
Op.: 101n.
174–5: 223–6n.
197–200: 251n.
565–7: 458n.
617: 2n.
Homer
Od.
9.240–2: 564n.
14.48ff.: 200n.
Horace
Carm.
1.28.5: 298n.
2.1.13: 21–2n.
3.1.41–8: 341n.
3.14.5: 650n.
4.5.20–2: 251n.

Josephius
Ant. Iud. 19.1.2: 201–2n.
Juvenal
1.74: 218n.

Livy
1.7.6: 547–8n.
1.7.8: 471–2n.
1.7.10: 583–4n.
1.19.6–7: 27–44n., 43–4n.
1.21.6: 27–44n.
4.7.10: 7n.
6.42.9–14: 637–50 (i) n.
6.42.10: 643n.
7.26.2: 602n.
34.1–8: 621–8 (i) n.
41.14.7: 83n.

Lucan
1.66: 17n.
1.308–9: 60n.
Lucretius
1.62–79: 295–310 (i) n.
1.68–9: 301–4n.
1.75–9: 309–10n.
1.722–5: 574n.
2.1–61: 295–310 (i) n., 301–4n.
5.436: 111n.
5.697: 78n.
Johannes Lydus
Mens. 4.1: 129–30n.

Macrobius
1.9: 89–288 (ii) n.
1.9.9: 173–4n.
1.9.11: 127n.
1.9.15: 129–30n.
1.12.2–3: 33–4n.
1.12.3: 27–44n.
Manilius
1.7–10: 17n.
1.511–12: 526n.
2.244: 49n.
2.507–9: 651n.
2.714–15: 45n.
2.738: 58n.
3.385–9: 45n.
4.366: 58n.
4.398–407: 301–4n.
5.416–17: 458n.
Martial
1.55.10: 186n.
4.1.1–4: 87n.
5.3.1–2: 286n.
8.2.1: 65n.
9.1.3–4: 286n.
9.58.5: 3n.

Petronius
120 (v. 94): 4n.
Plautus
Men. 6: 148n.
Mil. 321–2: 691n.
Pliny the Elder
Nat.
2.230: 84n.
8.155: 25n.
9.160: 153n.
14.5: 217–18n.
17.15: 216n.
18.234: 315–16n., 457–8n.

18.235: 651–2n., 653–4n., 655–6n.
33.153: 207–8n.
35.157: 201–2n.
Pliny the Younger
Pan. 88.6: 593–616 (ii) n.
Plutarch
Cam. 42: 637–50 (i) n.
Mor. 268a–d: 27–44n.
Mor. 278b–d: 621–8 (i) n.
Numa 12.2: 35–6n.
Numa 18: 27–44n., 33–4n., 43–4n.
Propertius
1.6.29–30: 253–4n.
1.14.17: 301n.
2.1.17–46: 13–14n.
2.10: 13–14n.
2.16.19–20: 199n.
2.19.15–16: 407n.
2.34.34: 301n.
2.34.59–64: 13–14n., 13n.
3.3.13–14: 177n.
3.8.35–6: 419n.
3.9.49: 243–4n.
3.9.57–60: 5–6n.
3.3.10: 722n.
3.13.47–50: 217–18n.
3.21.33: 301n.
3.24.1–2: 419n.
4: 1–2 (v) n.
4.1: 1–2 (v) n., 243–4n.
4.1.1–2: 243–4n., 515n.
4.1.1: 243n.
4.1.5: 201–2n., 202n.
4.1.6: 205n.
4.1.11–12: 204n.
4.1.19–20: 206n.
4.1.53–4: 526n.
4.1.69: 1–2 (v) n., 7–8n., 14n.
4.1.71–3: 5–6n.
4.1.147: 466n.
4.1.150: 311–14 (v) n.
4.2: 89–288 (ii) n., 89–288 (iv) n.
4.2.5–6: 639n.
4.2.55–6: 639n.
4.2.57–8: 162n.
4.4.13–14: 243–4n.
4.6.74: 76n.
4.8.3–4: 631n.
4.9.13: 560n.
4.9.20: 243–4n.
4.10.17–18: 199n.

Seneca the Elder
Con. 2.1.17: 217–18n.
Seneca the Younger
Dial.
12: 479–96n.
12.7.5ff.: 487–92n.
Servius
A.
1.291: 279–82n.
1.294: 279–82n.
7.610: 129–30n.
8.336: 633–6n.
Ecl.
1.33: 53n.
G.
1.43: 43–4n.
Silius Italicus
13.310: 259n.
Statius
Silv.
4.1.5–8: 87–8n.
4.1.45–7: 85–6n.
Theb.
2.97–8: 259n.
11.287: 60n.
Suetonius
Aug. 28.2: 70n.
Aug. 30.4: 203n.
Aug. 73: 205n.
Cal. 3.1: 21–2n.
Cal. 3.2: 25n.
Claud. 11.3: 25n.
Dom. 14: 355–8n.

Tacitus
Ann.
1.55ff.: 63–4n., 285–6n.
1.62: 26n.
1.83: 26n.
2.41.2: 285–6n.
2.49: 223–4n.
2.54: 20n.
2.83.3: 21–2n.
Theocritus
Ep. 4.13ff.: 418n.
Id. 1.81ff.: 418n.
Tibullus
1.4: 418n.
1.7.63–4: 87n.
1.8.47: 197n.
1.10.19–20: 201–2n.
2.1: 657–704 (ii) n.
2.1.1–8: 663–70n.
2.1.1–2: 669n.
2.1.5: 667–8n.
2.1.6: 665–6n.
2.1.7–8: 663n.

2.1.15: 75n.
2.1.17–20: 683–92n.
2.1.17: 681n.
2.1.21–2: 677–8n.
2.1.21: 681n.
2.1.25–6: 75n.
2.2.1–2: 72n.
2.5.23ff.: 203n.
2.5.23–6: 515n.
2.5.25: 243–4n.
2.5.55–6: 243–4n.
2.5.81–2: 26n., 75–6n.

Valerius Maximus
3.2.6: 602n.
4.4.11: 207–8n.
Varro
Ant. fr. 233 Card.: 140n.
Vit. Pop. Rom. fr. 15 Rip.: 203n.
L.
6.12–34: 27–62n.
6.12: 322n.
6.26: 669n.
6.33–4: 27–44n.
Vergil
Ecl.
4.15–16: 247–8n.
6.18–19: 369–70n.
6.31–40: 105–10n.
8.83: 413n.
G.
1: 657–704 (ii) n.
1.34–5: 311–14 (v) n.
1.40–2: 5–6n.
1.147–9: 349n.
1.185–6: 684n.
1.422: 155n.
1.505–8: 697–704n.
2.458–540: 295–310 (i) n.
2.490: 297n.
2.536–8: 337–8n.
3.495: 663n.
4.317–558: 363–80n.
4.317–20: 363–4n.
4.317: 379n.
4.355–6: 363–4n.
4.357–86: 365–6n.
4.387–414: 365–6n.
4.399–406: 369–70n.
4.404: 371–2n.
4.438–9: 371–2n.
4.440–1: 373–4n.
4.443–4: 373–4n.
4.457–9: 363n.
4.532–4: 363n.
4.543: 377n.
A.
1.1–11: 481–2n.
1.1: 13n., 489n.
1.257–96: 515–36 (i) n.
1.294–6: 701–2n.
2.11: 148n.
2.781–2: 241–2n.
4.333: 148n.
6.93–4: 520n.
6.756–886: 515–36 (i) n.
6.756ff.: 527–8n.
6.777–87: 27–44n.
6.808–12: 27–44n.
6.868ff.: 521–2n., 598n.
7.33–4: 155n.
7.120–1: 509–10n.
7.136ff.: 511–12n.
7.620–2: 265–6n.
8.51–4: 469–542 (i) n.
8.57–8: 499–500n.
8.62–3: 241–2n.
8.71ff.: 511–12n.
8.185–275: 543–82 (ii) n.
8.193: 555n.
8.194: 553–4n.
8.195–7: 557–8n.
8.198: 554n.
8.198–9: 571–2n.
8.201–2: 562n.
8.225ff.: 553–4n.
8.225–7: 563–4n., 563n.
8.226: 571–2n.
8.239–40: 567–8n.
8.249–50: 569–70n.
8.250: 570n.
8.251ff.: 571–2n.
8.306ff.: 243–4n.
8.314ff.: 233–40n.
8.333–6: 459–542 (i) n.
8.335–6: 499–500n.
8.347–8: 203n., 243–4n.
8.359–61: 243–4n.
8.362–5: 545n.
8.366–8: 200n.
8.654: 199n.
9.641: 307n.
10.474ff.: 521–2n.
10.837–8: 259n.
12.1–2: 60n.
12.919ff.: 521–2n.
Vitruvius
5.6.9: 423–4n.
7.5.2: 423–4n.